EXHIBIT B

	Page 1
1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
2	ATLANTA DIVISION
3	In re: Equifax, Inc. §
	Customer Data Security §
4	Breach Litigation § Case No.: 1:17-md-2800-TWT
5	
6	
7	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
8	ORAL DEPOSITION OF
9	MIKELL WEST
LO	TAKEN ON DECEMBER 4, 2019
L1	* * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * * *
L2	
L3	ORAL DEPOSITION of MIKELL WEST, produced as a
L 4	witness at the instance of the Class, and duly sworn,
L5	was taken in the above-styled and numbered cause on the
L 6	4th day of December, 2019, from 10:08 a.m. to 12:57
L7	p.m., before SYLVIA KERR, CSR, RPR, CRR, in and for the
L8	State of Texas, reported by machine shorthand, at the
L9	offices of Huseman Law Firm, 615 N. Upper Broadway,
20	Suite 2000, Corpus Christi, Nueces County, Texas,
21	pursuant to the Federal Rules of Civil Procedure and the
22	provisions attached hereto.
23	
24	
25	

	Page 2
1	APPEARANCES
2	
_	COUNSEL FOR THE CLASS:
3	MR. JAMES J. PIZZIRUSSO
	Hausfeld
4	1700 K Street, NW, Suit 650
_	Washington, D.C. 20006
5	(202) 540-7200
	jpizzirusso@hausfeld.com
6	
	MR. STEVEN NATHAN
7	Hausfeld
	33 Whitehall Street, 14th Floor
8	New York, NY 10004
	(646) 357-1194
9	snathan@hausfeld.com
10	
	COUNSEL FOR THE OBJECTOR:
11	MR. ERIC STEWART
	Huseman Law Firm, PLLC
12	615 N. Upper Broadway, Suite 2000
	Corpus Christi, Texas 78401
13	(361) 883-3563
	estewart@husemanfirm.com
14	
	MR. ROBERT W. CLORE
15	Bandas Law Firm, P.C.
	500 N. Shoreline Boulevard, Suite 1020
16	Corpus Christi, Texas 78401
	(361) 558-3527
17	rclore@bandaslawfirm.com
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
25	
د ے	

		Pa	age 3
1		INDEX	
2			
			PAGE
3			
		ances	2
4	MIKELL		_
5	E:	kamination by Mr. Pizzirusso	5
6			
•	Reporte	er's Certificate	109
7	_	s and Signature	112
8	_	-	
9		EXHIBITS	
LO	NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
L1	Exh 1	Notice of Deposition of Mikell Alan West	7
L2	Exh 2	Mikell West Website Bio	22
13	Exh 3	Objection of Class Member Mikell West	30
L 4	Exh 4	Declaration of Class Member Mikell West	54
L5	Exh 5	Equifax Data Breach Settlement	62
L 6	Exh 6	Description of Mr. West's Lawyers' Legal	
		Background and Prior Experience in Connection	
L7		with Class Action Litigation	68
18	Exh 7	Class Action Objector Power of Attorney and	=4
L9		Contingent Fee Agreement	71
L9	Exh 8	Coses in Which Debent Clare Christenham Ban	d
20	EXII 0	Cases in Which Robert Clore, Christopher Bandor the Bandas Law Firm, PC Have Represen	
20		Class Members in Filing an Objection to a Cl	
21		Action Settlement in the Preceding Five Year	
22	Exh 9	Notorious 'Serial Objector' May Have Filed	
		His Last Objection	79
23		-	
	Exh 10	Clark v. Gannett Co	80
24			
	Exh 11	Edelson v. The Bandas Law Firm Final	
25		Judgment Order	87
	I .		

		1	Page 4
1	NUMBER	DESCRIPTION	PAGE
2	Exh 12	Garber v. Office of Commissioner of Basebal	1 91
3	Exh 13	In re Cathode Ray Tube Antitrust Litigation	96
4	Exh 14	In re General Electric Company Securities	
		Litigation	. 97
5			
	Exh 15	In re Hydroxycut Marketing and Sales	
6		Practices Litigation	. 98
7	Exh 16	Defendant's Motion for Leave to Amend Answe	r
		and Withdraw Counterclaim and for Judgment	
8		on the Pleadings	. 100
9	Exh 17	Class Action Complaint and Demand for Jury	
		Trial	. 101
LO			
L1			
L2			
L3			
L 4			
L5			
L 6			
L7			
18			
L9			
20			
21			
22			
23			
24			
25			

	Page 5
1	MIKELL WEST,
2	having been first duly sworn, testified as follows:
3	EXAMINATION
4	BY MR. PIZZIRUSSO:
5	Q. We met before. My name is James Pizzirusso.
6	I'm with the firm of Hausfeld. We represent the class,
7	one of the on the PFC in the Equifax matter. Could
8	you state your name and spell it for the court reporter.
9	A. Sure. Mikell, spelled M-i-k-e-l-l, West.
10	Q. And what's your address, Mr. West?
11	A. 5109 Goldeneye, one word.
12	Q. And is that your home address?
13	A. Yes, that's correct.
14	Q. And have you ever been deposed before?
15	A. I have never been deposed before.
16	Q. Have you ever taken a deposition before?
17	A. I have taken many depositions.
18	Q. And you are an attorney, correct?
19	A. I am an attorney.
20	Q. About how many depositions would you estimate
21	you've taken?
22	A. It would be hard to guess, but 100 maybe.
23	Q. And you understand that in a deposition you're
24	under oath, correct?
25	A. I do understand.

- Q. Okay. Well, I'm just going to -- I'm sure you understand these, but I'm going to go over some of the ground rules of a deposition. It's being recorded, so obviously please speak up and give full and complete answers. Is that okay?
 - A. That's okay.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- Q. And if you don't understand the question, let me know; but if you answer it, I'm going to presume that you understood what I was asking, okay?
 - A. Absolutely.
- Q. And if you need a break, let us know.

 Obviously we would just ask that we not take a break in the middle of a pending question; is that okay?
 - A. That's fair.
- Q. And if you give an answer but then later remember something else that would clarify or further elucidate that answer, just let us know and we can put it on the record, okay?
 - A. I can do that.
- Q. And you're not on any medication, drugs or alcohol or sick or there isn't any reason why you wouldn't be able to answer truthfully today; is that correct?
- A. There is not anything.
 - MR. PIZZIRUSSO: Let's mark this as Exhibit

Page 7 No. 1. 1 2 (Exhibit No. 1 was marked.) (By Mr. Pizzirusso) I'm handing you what's 3 Q. been marked as Exhibit 1, the notice of deposition of 4 5 objector Mikell Alan West. Have you seen this document 6 before? 7 Α. I have. And your counsel shared it with you? 8 Ο. 9 Α. Yes, we looked at it together. 10 And do you know if you had any objection to Q. this notice? 11 12 I believe that giving a deposition was a Α. 13 requirement, and I was okay with that requirement. 14 And you're here because you objected to the 15 settlement in the Equifax case; is that correct? 16 Α. I did object, yes. 17 What do you understand the settlement to be? 18 Well, the settlement, I understand, consists of 19 many options or benefits to the class and a requested 20 fee award for class counsel. 21 What do you understand the benefits to the 22 class to be of the settlement? 23 There's primarily an option, I understand, for Α. 24 obtaining credit monitoring services, and there's an 25 alternative cash option, and there are options for

Page 8 1 various out-of-pocket expenses or time expenses. 2 Do you know what the totals for the various cash compensation are in the settlement? 3 When you say the total, do you mean the total 4 5 benefit or the maximum available benefit? 6 Well, let's start with maximum available 7 benefit. Do you know what that is? I understand from reading the notice that the 8 9 maximum available cash benefit was \$125, but I believe 10 even in the notice I think it said it was likely to be 11 significantly lower. 12 And the \$125, you think that's the total max 13 cash benefit that a class member can get for any part of 14 the settlement, or are you talking about something 15 specific? 16 That's the cash option that you can choose. 17 know there are out-of-pocket costs and time incurred 18 benefits that are separate from that. 19 That's the cash option as the alternative for 20 credit monitoring; is that what you're referring to? 21 That's my understanding. 22 Okay. And do you know how much you can get for Q. 23 out-of-pocket losses in the settlement? 24 I believe that part of it was up to \$20,000 or 25 something like that. I may be wrong.

- Q. And do you know how much you can get for time spent dealing with the Equifax data breach?
- A. I don't recall the specific of that. I think it was a total of maximum 20 hours at \$25 an hour maybe.
- Q. And you had no out-of-pocket losses or time and expense yourself; is that correct?
- A. I've had no out-of-pocket losses to date. You know, time and expense, I've spent time, you know, reviewing credit monitoring reports with the service I already have.
- Q. Did you make a submission for the time and expense for dealing with that?
- A. I believe I noted it on my -- on my claim. I don't think that it was a -- you know, not nearing \$20,000 or whatever the limit is; but I did note that I had spent time monitoring my credit reports.
- Q. Okay. But let me make sure I understand. So when you say you noted it, did you actually make a claim for up to ten hours that was allowed under the settlement at \$25 an hour for time spent monitoring your credit reports?
- A. I did note time spent on the form when I made a claim. I don't think that the claim form mentioned a rate. I think that was just in the class notice.
 - Q. Did you put in how much time you spent doing

Page 10 1 that? 2 I believe I put in an exemplar because I spent about, you know, 15 to 30 minutes reviewing my credit 3 report every month when I get my notices from Experian. 4 5 So just so I make sure I understand, when you 6 noted it, are you actually making a claim -- are you 7 expecting compensation for -- for that time that you spent looking at your credit reports from the 8 9 settlement? 10 A. Well, I'm not entirely clear on how that works as far as getting that compensation, but I did note it 11 12 because it was information requested when I made a 13 claim. 14 Okay. And you mentioned before you said \$20 to 15 \$25 an hour. Are you aware under the settlement that 16 you're actually allowed to get up to ten hours at \$25 an 17 hour without submitting any documentation for that 18 claim? 19 Well, I don't recall that, the specific from 20 the class notice. But, I mean, if that's what it says, 21 that's what it says. 22 Q. So that could be up to \$250 if you spent \$10 -sorry, if you spent 10 hours dealing with issues related 23

If that's what the class notice says. I don't

to the settlement, correct?

24

Page 11 1 recall the specifics of what it said. 2 Q. Okay. And you mentioned it earlier, but you're okay with sitting here for an objection today? You 3 didn't have any problem with that; is that right? 4 5 Α. I understand it's required. 6 What are you hoping to accomplish with your Ο. 7 objection? Well, I hope to improve the class settlement 8 9 benefits for everybody in the class. 10 And what -- what benefits would you, in 11 particular, like to improve? 12 Well, really I think that primarily the one 13 that I most focused on is the cash option is not a 14 significant compensation, especially in proportion to 15 the attorneys' fees award. 16 Q. What do you mean by in proportion to the 17 attorneys' fee award? Can you clarify? 18 I can try. You know, the cash option is that, Α. 19 you know, I've already got credit monitoring services, 20 and so I don't need that portion of the proposed 21 settlement. Really, the only thing that's left is a 22 cash option. And, you know, reading news articles, I 23 understand that given the number of claims, that's 24 likely to be, you know, very minimal.

Q. But you understand that you would be able to

Page 12 1 get cash for the time you've spent monitoring your 2 credit and submit that as well, right? Well, again, that is a -- it's a de minimis 3 type of, you know, compensation, I believe. 4 5 Well, if you spent ten hours dealing with 6 issues related to the settlement, that would be \$250 an 7 hour that you could claim in the settlement, right? \$250 an hour? 8 Α. 9 I'm sorry, \$250 total. If you spent ten hours 10 at \$25 an hour, you could claim up to \$250 without any -- providing any documentation? 11 12 And that's just based on evaluation of one's 13 time, I suppose. 14 Right. And that's more than the total that you 15 would be able to claim under the alternative compensation for credit monitoring, right, of \$125? 16 17 Assuming that \$125 was -- was achievable even. 18 Right. But that's -- I mean, up to \$250 is Q. 19 certainly more than potentially \$125, which -- and it 20 could be less, right? 21 Well, yes, \$250 is more than \$125. 22 Right. And, in fact, if you could document Q. 23 your time, you could get up to \$500 because 20 times 24 250 -- I'm sorry, 20 times \$25 an hour, you could get up

to \$500 just dealing with issues related to the

settlement, right?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. That -- that math checks out, I believe.
- Q. And do you know how your current credit monitoring compares to the credit monitoring being offered under the settlement?
- A. I currently have credit monitoring through Experian.
- Q. But do you understand -- do you believe that your current credit monitoring through Experian is the exact same as the credit monitoring being offered through the settlement?
 - A. I believe that it is.
- Q. Did you compare the benefits of the credit monitoring from the settlement to the credit monitoring that you currently have through Experian?
- A. I reviewed the -- the benefits. And I know that the monitoring that I've got through Experian, you know, I get monthly notices, I get dark web monitoring, I get alerts for any changes or, you know, hits on my credit report.
- Q. Do you have identity restoration services as part of your credit monitoring through Experian?
 - A. I'm not 100 percent certain on that.
- Q. But if that were being offered through the class settlement credit monitoring, and you were not

Page 14 currently receiving it, you would agree that that would 1 2 be an additional benefit that you could obtain under the settlement; correct? 3 Well, it would be something additional if I 4 I don't know the value of that 5 don't have that. 6 particular part of the credit monitoring. 7 Are you paying for credit monitoring from 8 Experian right now? 9 Yes, I have been for years. 10 Q. And how much do you pay a month; do you know? I believe it's between \$20 and \$25 a month. 11 Α. 12 And did you put in for compensation from the 13 settlement for the value that you have spent on credit 14 monitoring? 15 I don't believe that that was a -- explicitly an option that I can recall, to input that information. 16 17 And do you not think that it would be of 18 benefit to you to end your current payments of \$20 to 19 \$25 a month and take the free option from the Equifax 20 settlement? 21 To be honest, that sounds like a logistical 22 I'm not sure it's worth the time involved in hassle. 23 doing that. 24 But objecting to the settlement is worth the 25 logistical hassle and time involved in doing that?

- A. Well, it's a benefit in -- not just to myself, but to everyone in the class potentially, and I think that -- that benefit is of great magnitude.
- Q. Do you believe that the entire settlement should be thrown out?
- A. I think that a fair settlement should be reached.
- Q. And, in your mind, what would change in the settlement to make it fair?
- A. Well, you know, I -- my understanding is that this potential settlement was reached very early on. I'm not sure what potential additional benefits, you know, are available or were left on the table. It's really hard for me as a layperson in this aspect to -- to evaluate the details of that, and that's why I retained counsel.
 - Q. But you are an attorney yourself, correct?
 - A. I am an attorney.
- Q. And when you say your understanding that the case settled early on, what do you mean by that?
- A. That there was not a lot of significant litigation.
- Q. Could you describe what you mean by significant?
 - A. Well, I know class-action litigation takes

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Page 16 1 years at times, a lot of times. And, you know, we've 2 got a potential settlement fairly early on, my understanding. 3 Do you understand that there was a motion to 4 5 dismiss, briefed, argued and decided? 6 I am not personally familiar with the details 7 of the litigation. Have you read the complaint in this litigation? 8 0. 9 Α. I have not read the complaint. 10 Q. Have you read the motion to dismiss order? I have not read the motion to dismiss order. 11 Α. 12 So what is your -- on what are you basing your 13 statement that the case was settled early on without a lot of litigation? 14 15 Well, like I said, my understanding is that the 16 timeline for class-action litigation can be extensive in 17 that with the data breach happening in 2017 and here we 18 are in 2019, that seems to me -- you know, I've got 19 cases older than that. 20 Now, you said before you're not sure what was 21 left on the table in terms of the settlement when I 22 asked you what would you do to make the settlement fair, 23 correct? 24 Yes, I did say that. Α. 25 Q. So what's -- but you can't name anything

- specifically that you would change in the settlement to make it more fair?
- A. Well, I think the proportion of requested class counsel fee is significant and could be reallocated to provide additional benefit to the class.
- Q. But in terms of the actual terms of the settlement, putting aside attorneys' fees, the actual provisions of the settlement and the compensation and the benefits, is there anything that you would change under that?
- A. Well, the compensation and the benefits and the attorneys' fees, that is the entire settlement.
- Q. I'm not talking about attorneys' fees. I'm just talking about the actual benefit to class members.
- A. Well, we're talking about a pie, and you're saying ignore the largest slice of the pie, and what would you change about the rest of the pie.
- Q. Okay. So the only thing that you would change about the settlement then is putting some of the attorneys' fees back to the benefit of the class?
- A. Well, and there -- I'm not sure of the details, what other options are available. And this is outside of my, you know, experience as an attorney.
- Q. Right. Well, you're objecting to the settlement because you think there are problems with it.

I'm trying to find out from you what you would do to change it so I can see if there's some way we could fix your concerns. The only one I've heard you identify is fees and that switching them -- some of the fees from the attorneys to the class, you would think, would change it. I'm just trying to figure out what else, if anything, would satisfy your concerns.

- A. I think that would improve the cash option that's available to people like myself who already have credit monitoring services. I think that would potentially, you know, increase the proportion of the settlement available for out-of-pocket or, you know, incurred time, costs. I would not like to see the settlement changed to reduce any of the benefits to the class, for certain.
- Q. Right. But other than that, you can't think of anything else that you would change sitting here today?
 - A. Other than --
 - Q. Other than what you just said?
- A. Other than improving the benefits available to the class members?
- Q. The monetary compensation by giving less to the attorneys?
- A. Well, I'm not sure how it would be best to achieve that because I'm not a class-action litigator,

- but I would like to see a -- an improved benefit for the class members. And if that's where it needs to come from, you know, that's an option.
- Q. But an improved benefit just meaning more money for the class?
 - A. Absolutely.

- Q. Right. There's nothing -- there's no other improved benefit that you can think of other than more money for the class?
- A. Well, again, the credit monitoring service that's provided is something I already have. And so I'm not sure how to improve that for people who don't have credit monitoring that would be potentially a benefit for them. I wouldn't want to reduce any other benefits to the class, you know. If there was more available for out-of-pocket costs, I understand that that portion of the fund can run out on a first-come, first-serve basis. I think that the more benefits available for the class either in the cash option or otherwise.
 - Q. Is there anything else?
- A. I mean, I'm not sure if there's other options that can be added to the -- as additional benefits.
- Q. Right. But you -- sitting here today, you're not aware of any other options that can be added into the benefits?

Page 20 I wouldn't have the experience or knowledge to opine on that. If you were successful, do you think you should be paid attorneys' fees for your objection? I'm not acting as an attorney in this objection, so I personally would not be entitled to any fees. Q. Do you think your counsel should be paid if your objection is successful? I think if the class is benefited, I think my attorneys are entitled to be compensated for their time. Q. Do you think they should be paid on an hourly basis for their time? I get paid as an attorney on an hourly basis. I think that is a reasonable way to get paid. understand there are other ways to get paid. I'm not sure how class-action litigators are commonly compensated, but I understand the Court has that decision. Q. Do you think they should get paid for the time that they spent working on this matter for you? I think that they should. Α. And do you know what your attorneys charge per Q.

Veritext Legal Solutions

I know it's in the -- we had to list that in

www.veritext.com

hour?

Α.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Page 21 1 the objection. I recall reading it. I don't recall the 2 number. And what do you charge per hour as an attorney? 3 It varies, depending on the client. You know, 4 5 \$200 to, you know, \$350 an hour or something like that. If your attorneys were charging \$600 to \$700 an 6 7 hour, do you think that would be in line with Corpus Christi rates for people of their experience? 8 9 In this field of litigation, I think that that 10 is reasonable. 11 And what type of law do you practice? 12 I do civil litigation doing insurance defense Α. 13 work mostly. 14 And are you familiar with class actions? 15 You know, that depends on what you mean by 16 familiar. I know about them. I've never participated 17 in one before. I certainly have not represented anyone 18 in one before. 19 And when you say you've never represented 20 anyone, do you mean on the plaintiff or defense or 21 either one? 22 I have not at all. Α. 23 And I assume you're familiar with the federal 24 rules; is that right? 25 A. Of civil procedure?

Page 22 1 Ο. Yes. 2 Α. Yes, I am. And are you familiar with Rule 23? 3 If that's a class-action rule, I've probably 4 5 not read it because I don't do class-action litigation. 6 So I'm assuming you don't know, for example, the elements of Rule 23 in a class-action; is that 7 correct? 8 9 I can't say that I do. 10 MR. PIZZIRUSSO: Okay. Let's mark this as 11 Exhibit 2. 12 (Exhibit No. 2 marked.) 13 Q. (By Mr. Pizzirusso) And I've had the court 14 reporter mark as Exhibit 2 what appears to be your bio 15 from your firm's website; is that correct? 16 It's page 1 of 2 of my bio. 17 Is there something on the other side? Is it 18 printed on --19 I'm sorry. There it is on the back, yes. 20 Q. Okay. And this is the bio from your firm 21 website, right? Yes, it is. 22 Α. 23 I think we went over that. And you graduated Ο. law school in 2009; is that correct? 24 25 Α. I did.

- Q. And your professional associations, it says you are in the insurance law section of the State Bar of Texas, correct?
 - A. That is correct.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

- Q. And that -- I think you said that's the main area that you practice in, insurance defense; is that right?
 - A. Yes, primarily insurance defense.
- Q. And you're a member of the Texas Association of Defense Counsel; is that correct?
 - A. Yes, I am.
- Q. And have you ever seen anything that they've printed about class actions or been to a conference where class actions were discussed?
 - A. I've never been to a class-action conference.
- Q. But the Texas Association of Defense Counsel doesn't talk about class actions in any of their materials that you've seen?
- A. I couldn't tell you. I don't recall seeing one, but I've not sought out class action, you know, education.
- Q. And you're a member of the Corpus Christi Bar Association, correct?
- 24 A. Yes, I am.
 - Q. And are your counsel also members of that

Page 24 1 association, to your knowledge? 2 Α. My counsel? Your attorneys? 3 Q. In my firm? 4 Α. 5 Q. Your attorneys who represent you in this case? You'd have to ask them. I don't -- I don't 6 Α. 7 know. I think you said this before, but you've 8 Okay. never served as a class representative in a case; is 9 that correct? 10 That is correct. 11 12 And do you know what the duties of a class 13 representative are? 14 I can't say that I do. 15 Q. Have you ever participated in a class action as 16 a class member by making a claim in a case? 17 I don't think -- I may have, you know, opted in online for something and gotten, you know, a check for 18 19 \$1 in the mail before; but I couldn't recall what it was 20 for. 21 0. Have you ever opted out of a class action? 22 I have never opted out of a class action. Α. 23 Do you know what opting out means? Q. 24 I understand that you opt out of the 25 settlement, you don't participate in the benefits and

Page 25 you have the opportunity, if you so choose, to pursue 1 2 your own claim directly against the defendant. And did you consider that in this case? 3 0. I have not. 4 Α. 5 Q. Why not? 6 Well, my goal hopefully is to improve the 7 benefit of the class without -- I'm not trying to establish my own claim independently. 8 9 But if you don't like the settlement, why not 10 pursue your own claim independently? Well, you know, I'm not sure that -- that 11 12 that's something I would be interested in. 13 Q. Why? Well, you know, given the -- the, you know, 14 15 benefits that have been offered as part of the class, 16 I'm not sure what different benefits are -- would be available outside the class. I think that the best bet 17 to improve the settlement for myself and others is to 18 19 try to get a better settlement here. 20 And this is the first time you've ever objected to a class action; is that correct? 21 22 I have never objected to a class action before. Α. 23 Now, on your bio under representative Q. 24 experience, it says that you have handled hail, wind 25 damage claims; is that right?

Page 26 1 Α. Yes, I have. 2 And that wasn't a class action? 0. No, those are individual suits by homeowners or 3 Α. property owners against their insurance companies. 4 5 Q. Okay. Individual actions. 6 Α. 7 And you defended the insurance companies in those cases? 8 9 Α. Yes, I have. 10 Okay. Does your firm know that you're Q. objecting in the class action in this matter? 11 12 I may have discussed it with, you know, 13 acquaintances and friends at the firm. It's not, you 14 know, a firm-involved objection. 15 They know that you're being deposed today in 16 this case? 17 I've told a few people in passing. But, again, you know, just so they know where I am to find me 18 19 outside of the office. It is a workday. 20 Does your firm know who is representing you? Q. 21 Α. I might have mentioned Rob Clore in passing. 22 If your objection is successful, are you Q. 23 seeking to intervene as a class representative in this 24 matter? 25 Α. I'm not sure that I've, you know, considered

Page 27 1 I don't know. 2 Do you know if the firm would even permit that? Which firm? 3 Α. Q. Your firm? 5 A. My firm? 6 Q. Right. I'm not sure what -- I don't know. I couldn't 7 Α. answer that. 8 9 And do you think that you could negotiate a better settlement than the one that class counsel 10 11 appointed here have negotiated? 12 Well, again, I don't practice class-action 13 litigation. I'm here to see if the settlement can be 14 better for everybody. 15 And the way that you would make it better was 16 by taking money from the attorneys' fees and giving it to the class? 17 18 Well, I understand that there may be many 19 options available, and that's why I've, you know, 20 retained counsel that I trust to help me navigate this. 21 You know, again, it's my first time doing this. 22 And have your counsel given you any other 23 options that they think could make the settlement 24 better? 25 A. You know, we may have -- I don't recall what

Page 28 specifics we have discussed, but we've discussed 1 2 objecting to try to improve the settlement. And you do not plan to appear at the final 3 4 approval hearing; is that correct? 5 Α. Personally myself, no, I do not. But your counsel may appear on your behalf; is 6 Ο. 7 that right? 8 I understand that they may. Α. 9 What did you do to prepare for your deposition 10 today? 11 I met with my attorneys and reviewed the 12 documents that we filed. 13 Q. When did you meet with them? 14 Yesterday. Α. 15 And for about how long? Q. 16 Maybe a few hours. Α. 17 Did you meet with them at all other than Q. 18 yesterday in preparation for the deposition today? 19 In preparation for this deposition, no. Α. 20 And when you say "I met with my counsel," who 0. are you referring to specifically? 21 22 Α. Mr. Clore and Mr. Stewart. 23 And so Mr. Stewart is here. He wasn't on the 0. 24 retainer agreement or the papers, but you identify him 25 as one of your counsel in this matter as well; is that

Page 29 1 correct? 2 Α. Yes. Do you know what arrangement Mr. Stewart has 3 with Mr. Clore and Mr. Bandas and Mr. Froelich in terms 4 5 of how he is to be compensated for his time in this 6 matter? 7 I'm not aware of how he will be compensated. Α. Because there was a letter or an attachment to 8 Ο. 9 your objection that was a letter to Mr. Froelich about 10 how Mr. Froelich would be compensated, correct? recall seeing that? 11 12 I did see that letter, yes. Α. 13 Q. But you're not aware of any written arrangement between Mr. Stewart and the Bandas Law Firm, correct? 14 15 I'm sure that they have an arrangement, but I -- I don't know what it is. And I'm not -- I don't 16 17 have an interest necessarily to know. 18 Q. As a client, you don't want to know how your 19 counsel are providing any potential attorneys' fees in 20 your -- in your case? 21 I'm sure I could find out if I asked, but I 22 understand that, as you probably saw in the contract, I 23 won't be paying any of those fees. And so I believe 24 it's up to them to, you know, see how things work out 25 between them.

Page 30 1 And you said, I think, you reviewed the papers 2 that you filed when you were meeting with the attorneys yesterday in preparation for the deposition today; is 3 that correct? 4 I reviewed some documents. I reviewed some 5 6 more last night by myself. 7 And when you say documents, were those used to refresh your recollection in preparation for today? 8 9 It was all stuff that I had read before, yes. Α. 10 And was it all just your objection and the Q. attachments thereto? 11 12 Α. I believe I also reviewed the class notice 13 again. 14 Q. Okay. Anything else? 15 Α. I reviewed my contract with my attorneys. 16 0. Is that it? 17 Other than the objection and the attachments, I 18 think that would be it. 19 MR. PIZZIRUSSO: Mark this as Exhibit 3. 20 (Exhibit No. 3 was marked.) 21 0. (By Mr. Pizzirusso) And is this the objection 22 you've prepared for this case? 23 Well, that is the objection that my counsel 24 prepared and that I reviewed and signed. 25 Q. When did you first hear about the Equifax data

Page 31 breach; do you recall? 1 2 I recall talking with my brother-in-law about it several months ago. 3 So that was the first you heard about it 4 5 several months ago? Not when it happened? 6 You know, I may have seen it in the news. 7 That's the first recollection I've got of hearing about 8 it. 9 And who is your brother-in-law? 10 Α. His name is Florentino Ramirez. 11 Ο. And is he an attorney? 12 Α. He is not an attorney. 13 Do you remember why you were speaking with him 14 about it? 15 He's my brother-in-law. We are -- we're close. 16 We talk a lot about lots of things. 17 So at the time the data breach occurred, you 18 didn't go onto Equifax's website to see if you were 19 impacted by the breach at that time, right? 20 I don't -- I don't recall if I did or not. Α. 21 0. Okay. 22 I know I did it again recently. Α. 23 And recently you mean several months ago when Q. 24 you were speaking with your brother-in-law about it? I believe he sent me the link. 25 I don't recall

Page 32 if I did it at that time. 1 2 He sent you the link for the settlement? No, for the -- the link to check if you were 3 4 a -- potentially affected. 5 Okay. And do you recall when you first heard 6 about the settlement? 7 I recall seeing it in news articles online. 8 Approximately when; do you remember? 0. 9 Within the past several months. 10 And when did you think to engage counsel to Q. 11 explore options with respect to objecting in the 12 settlement? 13 Well, reviewing some of the articles and looking at some of the minimal benefits that were 14 15 available and finding out that I was a class member. 16 Q. So -- but when in the time frame would you say? 17 Like, do you recall the approximate date that that would 18 have occurred? 19 Within the last couple months. 20 Q. How did you come to engage counsel? 21 How did I -- how did I, like, meet counsel? 22 how did I --23 How did you end up retaining counsel? What 24 were the steps that occurred where you got to that point 25 that you hired an attorney?

- A. Well, I've known Rob for many years. I know what the practice is in the class-action litigation. I found out I was a class member, and so we -- I reached out to him.
 - Q. And how do you know Rob?
 - A. We used to work together.
 - Q. Where was that?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

- A. At my firm, Gault Nye & Quintana.
- Q. So Rob used to be an attorney at your -- your current firm?
 - A. That's correct.
 - Q. Okay. And do you know when he left?
- A. I want to say within the last five years. I couldn't put a more specific date on that. I know it's been a few years.
 - Q. And do you know if he went from there straight to the Bandas Law Firm?
 - A. I think that he did.
 - Q. And are you -- were you familiar with the Bandas Law Firm before Rob left and went there?
 - A. I was aware of the Bandas Law Firm, yes.
 - Q. Do you know Chris Bandas?
 - A. I've spoken to him on the phone. I may have met him in passing at a function in person, but any substantive speaking has been over the phone.

Page 34 1 And would you consider Mr. Bandas a friend of 2 yours as well? I don't know him that well. He's an attorney 3 Α. that I know has a good reputation in the community. 4 5 Q. And how about Mr. Stewart? 6 Mr. Stewart, we just met recently. 7 So you didn't know him prior to getting involved in your objection in this matter? 8 9 I did not, no. Α. 10 Okay. And you said, I think, that you were Q. 11 reviewing some articles online and you were concerned 12 about what you were reading about the settlement, and 13 that's when you reached out to Mr. Clore; is that 14 correct? 15 Α. That's correct. 16 He didn't call you; you called him? 0. 17 Α. With regard to this, yes. And we speak on the 18 phone and text, you know. I don't know about often, but 19 certainly frequently. We are friends. 20 Q. But the first mention of your potential 21 objection in the Equifax matter was raised by you? 22 Yes, I reached out to him. 23 And you knew that he had a practice Q. 24 representing objectors in other class-action

settlements?

A. Yes, I do.

- Q. And are you aware of his successes or lack of successes in similar types of objections?
- A. I understand that in class-action litigation and class-action objection, you know, there are successes and losses, just as in every area of the law.
- Q. But with respect to the Bandas Law Firm and Mr. Clore, did you go back and look at what has happened in some of the other cases that they've been involved in?
- A. Like I said, I've known Rob for years. And we talk, you know, casually as friends. I'm aware of their involvement and their successes and not so successes in other litigation.
- Q. When you say you're aware, I mean, have you read the opinions in the cases in which they have objected?
 - A. I don't know if I read an opinion.
- Q. Well, what's your general awareness then of their track record?
- A. I mean, I couldn't put a batting average on it.

 I know that they have some success, and they have some that they don't win.
- Q. And do you know if they've ever been criticized by judges for their objections in these types of cases?

Page 36 1 I'm sure they have. You don't practice law 2 long without get criticized by somebody. Q. And that didn't concern you as a client 3 retaining the Bandas Law Firm? 4 5 I've known Rob for years personally and he's 6 somebody I consider a friend and that I trust. 7 What about Mr. Bandas? You know, Rob works with him, and so he's got a 8 9 good judge of character in that respect. You know, like 10 I said, attorneys win and lose and, you know, everybody 11 gets criticized sometimes. 12 Did you go to the settlement website and review 13 the settlement materials before you hired counsel? 14 I reviewed the class notice. I, again, skimmed Α. 15 through the website when I was, you know, submitting my 16 claim. 17 But that was -- was that before or after you 18 engaged counsel? 19 I believe that was before. 20 Q. So you submitted a claim before you spoke with 21 Mr. Clore? 22 I can't recall if it was before we spoke or if it was after we spoke and before, you know, I officially 23

retained counsel. It was around the same area of time.

Q. Did you submit your claim before you retained

24

Page 37 1 counsel; do you know? 2 I know both my claim and my counsel retainer agreement were attached to the objection. I'd have to 3 look at the dates to give you an answer. Does this 4 include the exhibits? 5 It does not. But I have those and I'll --6 7 we'll get to them in a minute. I'm just trying to -- I know I saw that, too, but now I can't find it. Oh, here 8 9 it is. You're -- and we'll pull this out in a little 10 bit, but it looks like you filed a claim online on November 13th, according to your declaration. You don't 11 12 have any reason to dispute that, right? 13 Α. I'd have to -- to give you an answer, I'd have to look at it. I don't recall the date. 14 15 And your retainer agreement was signed on 16 November 15th, right? 17 Again, I'd have to look at it to tell you for 18 sure. 19 Q. Okay. 20 But if that's what's on the document. 21 And do you know how -- before you signed the 22 retainer on November 15th, how many days it had been 23 before that that you spoke with Mr. Clore? 24 I couldn't put a number of days on there. 25 I said, we'd speak, you know, frequently.

- Q. But you don't know if it was a week, two weeks, two days?
 - A. What was the --

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

24

- Q. How soon -- I mean, you -- you raised this issue with him. You didn't sign a retainer agreement, I assume, at that moment. You spoke about it. And then eventually you signed a retainer agreement. I'm trying to figure out the time lapse between when you first discussed this issue with Mr. Clore and the time in which you filed a claim -- I'm sorry, the time in which you signed a retainer.
- A. I believe when I spoke with Rob it may have been a couple of weeks before I understand that there was a quickly approaching deadline to object.
- Q. And were you planning to submit a claim prior to the time that you spoke with Mr. Clore?
- A. That was something I had discussed with my brother-in-law.
- Q. And discussed that you were planning to submit the claim?
 - A. He and I both talked about it.
 - Q. Did he submit a claim?
- A. I don't know if he did or not.
 - Q. Do you know if he was a class member?
 - A. Odds are good that he was, but I don't know if

Page 39 he was or not. 1 2 He never told you, I'm a class member, too, I'm going to submit a claim? 3 I don't have a recollection specifically of him 4 5 saying that, but I don't know if he's made a claim or 6 not. 7 Q. Did you tell him that you were going to object to the settlement? 8 9 I have not discussed objecting with him. 10 Q. And why didn't you represent yourself pro se? I'm sure you've heard the phrase that a lawyer 11 12 who represents himself has a fool for a client. 13 top of that, I don't practice class-action litigation. 14 And did you want an expert in class-action 15 litigation to represent you? 16 I wanted someone who certainly knew the ropes 17 better than I did, and I know that Rob does. 18 Do you know if Rob has ever represented Q. plaintiffs in a class-action case? 19 20 I couldn't tell you that he has or hasn't 21 represented or what side they were on. I don't know. 22 But you know he's handled objections in class 23 actions before? 24 I do know that, yes. Α. 25 Q. Have you ever litigated a case against Rob?

Page 40 1 Α. Against Rob? 2 Ο. Uh-huh. We've never had a case against each other. 3 Α. You haven't had an insurance defense case where 4 0. 5 Rob was representing plaintiffs, for example? 6 No, I have not done that. Α. 7 Or the Bandas Law Firm? 0. I believe we might have had a case years ago 8 Α. 9 with the Bandas Law Firm on the other side. I can't 10 remember how much I personally worked on that case or an associate did some of that. 11 12 And I believe you said before that your counsel 13 drafted your objection; is that correct? 14 That is correct. Α. 15 Q. Did you review it? 16 Α. I did review the objection. 17 Q. Did you offer any edits to it? 18 I may have pointed out a typo here or there. Α. 19 Did they express the concerns that they had 20 with the settlement to you? I know we discussed that. We had a 21 22 conversation about the settlement. 23 And what did you express concerns about about Q. 24 the settlement to them with? 25 Well, I know the things that you and I

Page 41 discussed previously about the minimal compensation and 1 2 the, you know, nonusefulness of the credit monitoring, as it's something I already have. 3 But, again, you didn't compare the benefits of 4 5 the credit monitoring offered in the settlement 6 line-by-line with the benefits offered by your current 7 \$20 a month plan, correct? I guess I could have racked up another couple 8 of hours, you know, to submit if I had done that. 9 10 no, I have not. Okay. And this objection that you have -- we 11 12 have marked as Exhibit 3, this contains all of your --13 all of your opinions about the settlement, correct? 14 It contains the meritorious objections to the 15 settlement. 16 But there's nothing else in the settlement you 17 oppose that you didn't put into this document, correct? 18 You know, if I spent some more time, I might be 19 able to find something else to complain about, but these 20 were the big things. 21 And has anything changed since you -- your 22 attorneys drafted this for you, to your knowledge, in 23 terms of your feelings about the settlement? 24 Α. In the last two weeks, no.

Did you review any of the other objections in

Q.

Page 42 1 this case? 2 I have not reviewed other objections. So you don't know whether you agree or disagree 3 0. with them? 4 5 Α. I couldn't say that I do or do not. 6 And I think we talked about this before, but 7 you have never read the underlying complaint in this 8 case, right? 9 I have not read the complaint. 10 And you never read the motion to dismiss Q. 11 decision? 12 I have not read any of the pleadings in this 13 case other than my objection. 14 And you've never been to the docket and seen 15 how many docket entries there were; is that right? 16 I have not reviewed the docket for this case. 17 But you have access to PACER as an attorney, 18 correct? 19 I have access to PACER as an attorney, that's 20 correct. 21 And do you have any thoughts about the 22 underlying merits of the litigation? 23 I'm not sure what you mean by that. 24 I mean, do you know whether or not the 25 plaintiffs had a chance at surviving summary judgment or

Page 43 1 getting a class certified in the litigated disputed 2 context? A. Well, I understand that there's a very large 3 class that, you know, potentially consists of half the 4 5 U.S. population that had their data broached. 6 think there is certainly some liability that Equifax has 7 for that. O. But this data breach is not an area of law in 8 9 which you practice, correct? 10 No, sir, it is not. So, I mean, do you think that this would have 11 12 been an easy case to prevail on? 13 I couldn't tell you the specifics of that one 14 way or the other. 15 Do you know how many data breach cases like 16 this have ever been certified as a class action in a 17 disputed litigation context? 18 I do not know how many. 19 Would it surprise you to hear that no damages 20 class has ever been certified in a data breach case 21 where there was a disputed class certification motion? 22 You know, without a context, I can't say that 23 that would be surprising or not. 24 And you think it's generally better, do you 25 not, to settle legal disputes when you can?

Page 44 1 Well, I think when it's in everybody's interest 2 and there's an equitable settlement for everyone involved, I think it can be beneficial. 3 And I know we talked about class actions. 4 5 may have said you may have submitted a claim online. 6 Are you ever aware that you submitted a claim in another 7 data breach class action? No, I don't believe so. 8 Α. 9 Now, turning to your objection on page 24, the 10 last page, is that your actual signature? 11 That is my actual signature. 12 So you signed this yourself with that squiggly Q. 13 mark? 14 I did. Α. 15 Okay. And you didn't authorize Mr. Clore or 16 anybody else to sign it on your behalf? 17 Α. I signed it myself. 18 Okay. And I think you said already that you reviewed the document and you agreed with everything 19 20 that was written in it; is that correct? 21 I did review and I did sign it. 22 Did you tell your attorneys what to write in 23 here or did you leave it to them? 24 They're the attorneys that practice.

wouldn't want to tell them how to write a document.

- Q. So is it safe to say that it's their objection as well as yours?
- A. No, it's my objection, but they're the ones who would know how to craft the appropriate legal document.
- Q. Turning to page 1 in your introduction, in the first sentence it says, "The requested 25 percent attorneys' fees from the portion of the settlement that class counsel actually negotiated; i.e., \$310 million is grossly excessive for mega fund settlement in this district." Do you know what you meant by "actually negotiated" there?
- A. I understand that there was an additional settlement benefit that I believe was obtained by a federal agency that added to the pie that was not negotiated by class counsel.
 - Q. Do you know what that additional was?
- A. It may be \$80 million. I could be wrong about that. That sounds right, though.
- Q. Do you know if there's additional compensation, cash compensation, available beyond the \$310 million and the \$80 million for an extended claims period? Have you heard about that?
- A. I recall reading something that said extended claims period in the notice. I don't recall the specifics.

- Q. So do you think that the settlement value negotiated by class counsel is only \$310 million?
 - A. I believe that's -- that's accurate.
- Q. Have you considered the value of the credit monitoring that class counsel negotiated as well?
- A. Well, I believe that portion of that settlement is included in that. But, you know, the value to people like myself who already have credit monitoring is minimal.
- Q. And do you know that class counsel negotiated additional injunctive relief as well?
- A. Well, I understand that there are, I guess, practice changes that were negotiated. You know, I would think that that would be stuff that Equifax should have already been doing or should have been doing, you know, on their own.
- Q. But they weren't, according to the settlement?

 They were required to do it under the settlement, right?
- A. Well, I think that best practices improve over time for sure.
- Q. And do you think that's an additional benefit to the class if Equifax is improving their security practices in the future?
- A. I'm not sure how tangible of a benefit that is.

 Again, those being things that ideally they would have

Page 47 1 been doing already. 2 But if they weren't, it would be a tangible benefit, would it not? 3 It would be an intangible benefit. 4 5 Well, if they committed to spending a certain 6 amount of money, I mean, that's at least -- you can 7 pinpoint their expenditures on additional security, 8 correct? 9 Well, you know, I don't know the details of 10 what they've agreed to do and how much they're going to 11 spend on it, so I couldn't speculate on that. 12 But don't you think you should include the 13 value of all of the value of the benefits in a 14 settlement when you're considering what the total value 15 is? We could certainly consider all the benefits, 16 Α. 17 yes. 18 And if the benefits in this settlement that Ο. 19 class counsel negotiated were valued at over \$1 billion, 20 do you think the class counsel should get a portion of 21 the overall benefit of the settlement? 22 I'm not sure how -- how that number would have 23 been calculated. 24 But hypothetically you say 10 percent of the 25 value would be reasonable for attorneys' fees, correct?

A. I'm sorry?

- Q. In your objection you say that 10 percent of the value of the settlement would be reasonable for attorneys' fees instead of the 25 percent, right?
 - A. I think of the cash value of settlement.
- Q. But if there's additional benefits beyond the \$310 million that you're pointing to here that were as a direct result of class counsel, they should get credit for that as well, shouldn't they?
- A. Well, I'm not sure how that would be calculated. I think that you know that's something that the court is going to take up when reviewing the settlement and the fee award.
- Q. But you have no problem with class counsel getting 10 percent of the value of the settlement they negotiated?
- A. I don't have a problem with the class counsel being compensated for the work that they've done in a reasonable matter.
 - Q. And you say that should be ten percent, right?
- A. I think -- you know, as indicating ten percent or the reasonable cash value. Or, you know, potentially the time and expense that they've spent on the case.
- Q. And you mentioned a mega fund in here. Do you know what constitutes a mega fund?

- A. I couldn't tell you an exact threshold of what constitutes a mega fund.
- Q. In the second and third paragraphs in your introduction you refer to numerous and substantial -- or actually, let's see -- outrageous 14 enumerated requirements. Do you see that in the third paragraph?

 And numerous and substantial roadblocks in the second paragraph?
 - A. Yes, I do see that.
- Q. And what -- what roadblocks are those that you're referring to here?
- A. Well, I know there are a number of requirements that had to be met to be able to object at all to the settlement.
- Q. What requirements are you referring to that were roadblocks?
- A. Well, the most -- you know, personally the most difficult one is providing four dates over a two-week period. That's two weeks after the objection deadline of which, you know, a week of that is lost for the Thanksgiving holidays.
 - Q. But you were able to provide dates, correct?
- A. Well, it was important to me, and so I made the effort to do that.
 - Q. And it didn't deter you from filing your

Page 50 1 objection, correct? It didn't deter me, but it most likely deterred 2 countless others, I bet. 3 Well, how do you know? Have you spoken to 4 5 anybody else who it deterred? I have the luxury of being able to take time 6 7 off to come here; a lot of people don't. And do you know if everybody who has objected 8 9 has been deposed? 10 I couldn't answer that one way or the other. Q. Is that the only roadblock you're referring to 11 12 there? 13 That's the most, you know, one that stands out. I know there were all kinds of requirements that had to 14 15 be met. Thankfully I was able to reach out to Rob to 16 handle most of those. 17 But what are the other ones you're referring to 18 that you think were roadblocks? 19 You know, again, there were 14 things listed on 20 the class notice of what had to be done. I know there 21 were roadblocks to potentially finding an attorney. 22 That would be more difficult that an attorney would have 23 to meet to be able to represent an objector in this 24 case. 25 Q. Like what?

- A. Oh, them having to provide background information for right copies of the fee agreement, provide all kinds of information. And I'm sure you've got a copy of the class notice that we could look at.
- Q. I'm just trying to figure out why you thought that those were roadblocks.
- A. Because they are impediments and additional requirements that, you know, can stop people from participating and wanting to object.
- Q. But how? How is it an impediment that you've got to provide background information and a fee agreement?
- A. Well, it's hard for other people. I'm not saying myself necessarily, but it's hard for people who don't have, you know, people like Rob, a friend of mine who does this to help me out.
- Q. How would it be hard for somebody who doesn't have a friend like Rob?
- A. Well, they're not going to have somebody who can navigate all the requirements of the class notice.
- Q. Providing a fee agreement and background information, you don't think an attorney would be able to do that without it being a roadblock? I think what you said a substantial roadblock?
 - A. Well, again, I say the primary one is having to

Page 52 provide four dates of availability in essentially a 1 2 six-day business day window. Q. But, I mean, you could have asked for dates --3 in fact, we discussed dates with your counsel, are you 4 5 aware, outside of that window? I know what's in the class notice. I'm not 6 7 aware of communications you've had necessarily with my counsel. 8 9 So the only substantial roadblock that you 10 think then is having to provide dates for a deposition? I think that is one substantial impediment. 11 12 I'd have to review the list to recall others. 13 Q. And the others that you mentioned were 14 impediments to your counsel, not to you, right? 15 Well, they're impediments to people like myself 16 who are trying to obtain counsel. But it wasn't an impediment to your ability to 17 18 obtain counsel, right? 19 Α. To me, no. 20 And you don't know of anybody else who had an 21 impediment to obtaining counsel based on those 14 22 requirements that you discussed, right? 23 I've not discussed, you know, the objection Α. 24 with anybody else to get their experience with it. 25 MR. STEWART: Can we take a quick break?

Page 53 1 MR. PIZZIRUSSO: Sure, this is a good 2 stopping point. (A recess was taken.) 3 (By Mr. Pizzirusso) Before we took a break we 4 0. 5 were just talking about the impediments to obtaining 6 counsel for the objection, right? 7 That's correct, yes. Α. And you understand you don't have to have an 8 9 attorney to file an objection in this case, correct? 10 Α. I do not need an attorney, correct. 11 And any objector wouldn't need an attorney. 12 Anybody could file without an attorney, correct? 13 Α. Yes. Anyone could represent themselves. 14 And so even though you didn't have any 15 impediments yourself in obtaining an attorney, you think 16 the entire settlement should be thrown out? 17 I think the settlement could be improved. 18 So you don't think it should be thrown out; you Q. 19 just think it should be improved? 20 Well, if it can be improved, I think it should 21 be improved. If it can't be improved, I'm not sure what 22 the -- what the next step is. 23 But improving it, in your mind, is just putting Q. 24 more money into the kitty for class members from the 25 attorneys' fees, right?

Page 54 Either that or, you know, finding more money to 1 2 add to the settlement. MR. PIZZIRUSSO: Mark that as Exhibit 4. 3 (Exhibit No. 4 was marked.) 4 5 Q. (By Mr. Pizzirusso) And do you recognize this 6 as the declaration you submitted attached to your objection? I'm sorry, maybe I gave you the wrong thing. 7 Let me look at that again. Oh, it is. I'm sorry -- no, 8 I gave you the right thing. The exhibit has another 9 10 exhibit to it, correct? Two exhibits to it. 11 12 Two exhibits. And this is your -- your claim 13 summary and your proof of submission of a claim, 14 correct? 15 Α. One is the claim and one is the notification 16 that I'm a member of a class, of the class. 17 Right. Did you prepare this declaration? 18 I did not type it up. I reviewed and signed Α. 19 it. 20 Q. Okay. And you filed a claim online; is that 21 correct? 22 I did file a claim online. 23 And it looks like, according to the last page 24 of this, that you filed your claim on November 13th, 25 correct?

Page 55 1 Α. Yes, November 13th, 2019. All right. We were talking about that earlier. 2 Now you say explanation of time spent, and you say, 3 "reviewing credit monitoring reports from Experian 4 5 related to data compromise alerts, this has been a 6 repeated time expenditure with the regular reports from The October time is an estimate of the 7 Experian. regular amount of time routinely spent." Do you see 8 9 that? 10 Α. Yes, I see that. 11 0. And you say 15 minutes? 12 I did put 15 minutes as an estimate, yes. Α. 13 Q. All right. And then you said no money lost or 14 spent, right? And no documents selected? 15 Α. I have not had any out-of-pocket expenses to 16 date. 17 Right. And so how do you think you were harmed 18 by this data breach? 19 Well, my personal data has been compromised and 20

- made available with the cyber attack to who knows what types of people.
- But you have no out-of-pocket losses related to that, that you have claimed or that you're aware of, correct?
 - A. No out-of-pocket losses; that's correct.

21

22

23

24

- Q. And so if you already have credit monitoring and you don't want to take the new credit monitoring from the settlement, why do you think you should be entitled to a cash payment at all?
- A. Well, I think that as a member of the class who has been harmed by the exposure of my data, I'm entitled to compensation, as is every member of the class.
- Q. Well, there's not compensation for the mere exposure of your data, correct, in the settlement?
- A. Well, the entire settlement is compensation for the exposure of the data.
 - Q. That's how you view the settlement?
- A. Well, the class-action lawsuit is, I understand, based on the exposure of the data, and that's why there's been litigation, and that's why there's a settlement.
- Q. Do you think you would have an entitlement to monetary compensation for the mere exposure of your private data in another case?
 - A. I'm not sure what exactly you mean by that.
- Q. So let's -- let's say a hypothetical. You have your data, it's given to a company, that data gets stolen, but you're never harmed. It's never used. You don't even know if anybody ever viewed it. You just know that it was stolen from the company.

Page 57 You think you should be entitled to compensation by the mere fact that your data was stolen from that company even if you were never the victim of any kind of identity fraud or theft? Α. I think the harm is difficult to quantify. And -- but you think you have a financial harm from that? I think there is a significant potential financial harm. Potential financial harm, but not an actual harm? Well, luckily I've not had any out-of-pocket losses to date. And so if you don't have out-of-pocket Right. losses, you still believe you should be entitled to a cash payment? Α. I think every member of the class is entitled to a benefit from the settlement. And every member of the class is Q. Right. getting a benefit from the settlement, correct? Α. Nominally, yes. And we discussed before that you could have Q. filed your own case and opted out, but you decided you

I did not have an interest at this time in

didn't want to do that, right?

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Page 58 1 opting out and filing my own case. 2 Q. Did you contact the class counsel in this case to ask them any questions that you might have had about 3 the settlement? 4 5 I did not contact class counsel. I contacted 6 mv friend Rob. 7 And you didn't think to reach out to class counsel first to express any concerns you had to see if 8 9 they could be addressed before filing an objection? 10 Well, I reached out to Rob, knowing that he's familiar with this type of litigation and issues. And 11 12 so I started with someone that I knew and trusted. 13 And do you know if Rob reached out to class 14 counsel to ask them any questions? 15 Α. I couldn't tell you if he did or not. 16 Do you know if Rob reached out to express any 17 concerns or hurdles with the way the objection process 18 went? 19 I couldn't tell you if he did or not. 20 And if additional money was provided to the class from the settlement without reducing the amount 21 22 paid in attorneys' fees, would that satisfy your 23 concerns? 24 That's a very abstract, you know, hypothetical. Α. 25 Q. Okay. Well, you in specific -- the fees

requested were 77 and a half million dollars. You think they should be 31 million dollars. So if there was an additional -- what's the math -- \$46.5 million that went into the settlement that didn't impact the amount paid in to attorneys' fees, would that satisfy your concern?

- A. I can't speculate on that. And I don't think that that's ten percent math anyways.
- Q. I'm not doing the math. I'm just asking if your contention is that the attorneys' fees should be reduced from 77.5 to \$31 million, why do the attorneys have to be harmed or get less money in order to satisfy your concern that an additional \$46.5 million went into the settlement?
- A. Well, I'd have to look at the proposed terms of whatever the additional \$46.5 million do. I mean, I can't answer that in a hypothetical.
- Q. Back to your objection, I think that's Exhibit

 3. On page 3 you say in the second sentence, "although
 this objection is asserted on behalf of Mr. West alone,
 it applies equally to the class as a whole and
 particularly to class members like him with existing
 credit monitoring." Do you see that?
 - A. What page?
 - Q. Page 3.
 - A. I'm sorry.

Page 60 1 Q. Second sentence at the top. 2 Α. Okay. I see that. 3 Are you trying to represent a class of 4 objectors here? 5 I'm only objecting on behalf of myself, but the 6 goal is to improve the settlement for everyone. 7 And you say "who are likely to receive minuscule payments." What do -- how much is minuscule, 8 9 in your mind? 10 A. Well, I've seen news articles that with the 11 number of potential class claimants, that the 12 alternative option could be as little as 50 cents for a 13 class member. And so 50 cents would be minuscule; is that 14 15 what you're referring to by that statement? 16 I think that would be very minuscule. 17 And do you know how many class members would 18 have to have valid claims in order for there to be a 50 19 cent claim? Do you remember what that article 20 mentioned? 21 I don't recall a number of class members 22 required. 23 Do you know how much additional 46 and a half 24 million taken from attorneys' fees, even if it was all 25 added to the alternative compensation for credit

Page 61 1 monitoring that you're complaining about, do you know 2 how much that would add per class member to that number? I couldn't do the math and tell you without 3 4 knowing more information. 5 Well, let's say there were 10 million claims 6 submitted there, and that would be \$4.65 per class 7 member. Do you think that would be a substantial increase to that number that it would satisfy you? 8 9 Well, that would be a tenfold increase. But, 10 again, that's probably not the only option for improving 11 the -- there are probably several options, including 12 that, to improve the class benefits. 13 Well, that's the option that you talk about in 14 your papers. You don't mention any other one, do you? 15 Α. That is one option. 16 Well, what other options do you mention in here 17 that you're -- you would do instead? 18 I think that is the primary objection to the Α. 19 settlement contained explicitly within the brief here, 20 but we do incorporate other objections to the adequacy 21 and reasonableness of the settlement in whole. 22 But you haven't reviewed those objections, you 23 said, correct? 24 Α. I have not reviewed those personally, no.

And you don't know what -- what they contain,

Q.

Page 62 1 right? I couldn't give you details as to what any of 2 3 the pleading contains. 4 MR. PIZZIRUSSO: Let's mark this as Exhibit 5. 5 (Exhibit No. 5 was marked.) 6 7 (By Mr. Pizzirusso) I'm handing you a copy of 8 the frequently asked questions from the settlement 9 I think you said you've been to the website website. and reviewed this; is that right? 10 I went to the website and I looked at several 11 12 pages. I didn't study the website. 13 Q. Now, if you go to the second page of this document at No. 7 --14 15 Α. The second page goes to No. 3. 16 Q. I'm sorry. I have a different one than you. 17 Keep going. It should be the second page. Yes. 18 there a -- it's got a little mark on it. Do you see 19 that? 20 Α. Yes. 21 Okay. So this is "how will the settlement 22 compensate me for identity theft I've already suffered, 23 the money I've already paid to protect myself and my 24 time spent on those things?" The one that I marked 25 there, the second bullet point under payment for

unreimbursed out-of-pocket losses, you see where it says credit monitoring or identity theft protection costs you paid on or after September 7th, 2017?

- A. I see that marked bullet point.
- Q. So that was something you could claim on the claim form if you're paying Experian for credit monitoring costs, correct?
 - A. That's what it looks like.
 - Q. And you didn't make that claim, did you?
 - A. I have not made that claim.
- Q. Now, if you go -- scroll down to the next one, next Point 8, "how will the settlement help me protect against future identity theft and fraud?" Do you see that? It's at the bottom of the page.
 - A. I see that.
- Q. It says settlement benefit credit monitoring services. It says, "The settlement provides a way to help protect yourself from unauthorized use of your personal information. Settlement class members may submit a claim to enroll in at least four years of three bureau credit monitoring services provided by Experian at no cost. These services include the following features: free bureau credit monitoring providing notice of changes to your credit report at all three national credit bureaus." Do you know if your current

Page 64 Experian credit monitoring includes all three bureau 1 2 credit monitoring? I know that it provides access to all three 3 Α. bureaus at some interval. 4 5 Do you know if it provides up to a million 6 dollars in insurance covering costs related to identity 7 theft or fraud? Sitting here today, I couldn't tell you. 8 9 Do you know if it provides real-time 10 notification of credit inquiries and other 11 notifications? 12 If that means up-to-date email alerts for 13 credit inquiries, then yes. 14 Do you know if it provides on-demand online 15 access to a free copy of one bureau credit report 16 updated on a monthly basis? 17 I get access to a credit report email 18 notifications every month. 19 Do you know if it provides cyber agent dark web 20 monitoring that monitors Internet activity for the 21 trading or selling of your personal information? 22 I don't know if it's a cyber agent, but I do 23 receive emails -- I have received emails from Experian 24 saying that my data is on the dark web. 25 And -- but currently you're paying \$20 or \$25 a

Page 65 1 month for that service, right? 2 I am paying for that service. And so what does that come out to a year, do 3 0. 4 you think? 5 Α. Forgive my math if I'm wrong, but maybe \$300 a 6 year. 7 And under the settlement, it would be provided 8 for four years for free, correct? 9 Α. That's my understanding, yes. 10 So instead of applying for the free credit Q. 11 monitoring and the alternative compensation of \$125 --12 I'm sorry, instead of applying for the free credit 13 monitoring and saving yourself \$1200 over four years, 14 you're objecting that instead you can't claim \$125? 15 I think that's a logistical hassle to have to 16 create a new account, disable my old account after four 17 years, lose that account and go back to my old account. 18 Everything is set up, and there's an opportunity cost in 19 having to start from scratch. 20 Is it a \$1200 opportunity cost? You'd rather 21 pay -- you'd rather lose ten times the amount you could 22 save by signing up for the free credit monitoring and 23 complaining about not getting \$125 cash? 24 It's a service that I already paid for that I 25 already see value in, that I already have obtained on my

own.

- Q. But in six months you would save more than you pay for that service alone; and here you'd be getting it for four years, plus another six years of one bureau credit monitoring after that, so ten years potentially of credit monitoring. And you'd rather pay that money out of cash and only get \$125?
- A. Well, again, it's -- it's a service I already have. It's something that I've already -- you know, there's an opportunity cost involved in taking the time to do that.
 - Q. A \$1200 opportunity cost?
- A. I haven't done the math, but I don't know the difficulty of the logistics of doing that.
- Q. Well, the logistics are just cancelling one and signing up for a new one through the web -- through claim online. I mean, that's -- you already signed up for the claim -- you already submitted a claim already. It would literally just be submitting a new claim and cancelling your old service.
- A. I couldn't answer what's involved, not having done that.
- Q. I'm just trying to understand rationally why you think adding another \$4.65 to the alternative compensation is a better deal than taking \$1200 in free

Page 67 1 value from not paying \$20 or \$25 a month. I just -- I 2 don't get it. Can you explain it to me? It's the -the opportunity cost is the only thing that you -- or 3 the logistical concerns? 4 5 It's a -- it's not insignificant. And that's 6 assuming that, you know, \$46 million from the attorneys! 7 fees is the only potential added benefit to the class. Q. That was the only benefit that -- you just read 8 9 through your entire -- your entire objection. That was 10 the only benefit you mentioned in your objection, right? 11 That is one benefit, but there are other 12 objections that we -- that we incorporate to the 13 reasonableness and sufficiency of the settlement in 14 whole. 15 And you could have also claimed for, as we just saw, the time -- the money you've spent for your credit 16 monitoring services since September, and you didn't make 17 18 that claim, right? 19 I think that was kind of buried in the FAQ. 20 did not make a claim for that, no. 21 And you didn't make a claim for the time you 22 spent monitoring your credit reports after the data 23 breach, right? 24 I did include that on my -- on my claim form.

But then you also say you have no out-of-pocket

Q.

Page 68 losses? 1 2 Well, I'm not sure of how out-of-pocket losses Α. 3 are being defined. MR. PIZZIRUSSO: Let me mark this as 4 Exhibit 6. 5 6 (Exhibit No. 6 was marked.) 7 (By Mr. Pizzirusso) I've handed you what's been marked as Exhibit 6. This was also an attachment 8 9 to your declaration. Do you recall seeing this? 10 Α. I have seen this before. It says "a description of Mr. West's lawyer's 11 12 legal background and prior experience in connection with 13 class-action litigation, " correct? 14 Α. That's what the title says, yes. 15 And if you turn to Mr. Clore, it says in his description at the bottom of page 1, "He has assisted in 16 17 securing many victories on behalf of clients in both 18 personal injury and class-action matters." Do you see 19 that? 20 Α. Yes, I see that. And do you know -- I think we talked about this 21 22 earlier, but do you know if he's actually ever 23 represented plaintiffs in a class action? 24 I don't know the answer to that. Α. 25 So do you know what victories he's referring to Q.

Page 69 1 here? 2 I couldn't tell you what specifically he's referring to here. 3 If you turn it over to the next page, the last 4 5 sentence in Mr. Clore's description says, "Mr. Clore's 6 experience in class-action litigation is assisting class 7 members in objecting to unfair settlements and excessive fee requests." Do you see that? 8 9 Α. I do see that. 10 So you're not aware that he's actually ever 11 prosecuted them; he just lists here the fact that he 12 assists class members in objecting to settlements, 13 right? 14 I don't know the extent of his experience in 15 litigation, but I do see that he has assisted class 16 members there. 17 And you didn't ask him the extent of his 18 experience before you retained him? 19 I have not asked him for a resumé of all of the 20 cases that he's handled. 21 Don't you think having an attorney experienced 22 in prosecuting and settling class actions would be 23 helpful to knowing whether a class-action settlement was

A. I think Rob has the reputable experience to

good or bad?

24

Page 70 1 represent me in this matter. 2 And then turning to Mr. Bandas, do you know what type of law Mr. Bandas generally handles? 3 I couldn't tell you the extent or breadth of 4 5 the kind of cases he handles. 6 Have you ever seen his ads on TV? 7 To be honest, if it's not on Hulu, I haven't Α. 8 seen any ads. 9 Do you know if he's ever litigated a 10 class-action case? I couldn't tell you one way or the other. 11 12 Do you see the third sentence here where it 13 says "though he has been criticized by some courts for his representation of objecting class members," do you 14 see that? 15 16 I see that sentence. 17 Do you know what that's referring to? 18 I'm assuming that he has represented objectors Α. 19 and had significant success in improving class 20 settlements. 21 But this says -- I mean, this is his own bio 22 that he wrote. He says he has been criticized by some 23 courts. Do you know what the criticizing is all about? 24 I've not read a specific criticism of him, so I 25 don't know what specifically courts have said about him.

Page 71 1 Q. And that didn't cause you concern to say, well, I should go see what courts are saying about my counsel 2 in this case? 3 4 Again, my primary contact has been through Rob, 5 who's an attorney I've known for ten years, both professionally and personally. 6 7 Q. But Mr. Bandas signed the retainer of you, 8 correct? 9 I believe he's the principal of the firm. That would be his role. 10 MR. PIZZIRUSSO: Let's mark this as Exhibit 11 12 No. 7. 13 (Exhibit No. 7 was marked.) 14 (By Mr. Pizzirusso) This is the retainer that Q. you signed with the Bandas Law Firm, correct? 15 16 This is the agreement, yes. 17 And on page 5, that's your handwritten 18 signature again? 19 That is my handwritten signature. 20 Q. Okay. And if you go to 1.3 of this on the 21 first page, purpose of representation, do you see that? 22 I do see that paragraph. Α. 23 And then if you sort of scroll down to the 24 middle it says "you acknowledge that prior to the 25 execution of this agreement, you contacted me seeking

Page 72 legal advice about your rights and options as a class 1 2 member, " right? I see that sentence. 3 And Mr. Bandas is the one who signed this 4 0. 5 agreement, correct, not Mr. Clore? 6 Α. That is Chris's signature. 7 But you did not speak with Mr. Bandas? 0. I did speak with Mr. Bandas. 8 Α. 9 So -- okay. So you -- this is correct then, 10 that you did contact him seeking legal advice about your rights and options as a class member? 11 12 I did contact the Bandas Law Firm and I have 13 spoken to both Rob and Chris about the case. 14 And then it says, "you further acknowledge the 15 following: 1, that you were not solicited by me or any 16 other lawyer." Do you see that? 17 Α. I do see that. 18 So neither Mr. Bandas nor Mr. Clore solicited Ο. 19 you to serve as an objector in that case; is that your 20 testimony? 21 They have not solicited me to serve as an 22 objector. 23 Q. Okay. And then it says, No. 2, "you have not 24 been paid or promised any money incentive or any other 25 consideration to assert your rights as a class member

with an interest in the proposed settlement." Do you see that?

A. I do see that.

- Q. So you're not seeking any money on your own behalf as a part of your objection; is that true?
- A. I understand that if the class settlement is improved that, you know, the court may award an incentive award. But, you know, the goal is to improve the class settlement.
- Q. And would you waive the ability to seek such an incentive award for yourself?
 - A. I couldn't answer that question today.
- Q. And at 3.2 of this agreement it says, "The attorneys may petition the court for a payment to you or may ask class counsel or defendants to make a payment to you in recognition of your service as an objector and/or for other factors related to your service as an objector. This is referred to herein as an incentive award or incentive payment. You understand any incentive award or payment sought will never exceed \$5,000." Do you see that?
 - A. I see that in the paragraph.
- Q. And did the Bandas Law Firm suggest that you would get \$5,000 for serving as an objector in this case?

- A. They haven't made any, you know, suggestions or intimations of what I might get.
- Q. Do you know how much the class representatives in the actual litigation are seeking for incentive awards to serve as class representatives in the case?
 - A. I do not know what they're seeking.
- Q. Would it surprise you to find out that it's actually \$1500 and not \$5,000?
- A. No, I couldn't tell you if that's normal or abnormal. That doesn't surprise me one way or the other.
- Q. Do you think that you should get more than a class representative in an incentive award for objecting to a settlement?
- A. You know, that's not -- we have not discussed an amount. I mean, this simply sets a ceiling.
- Q. Would you agree that you shouldn't get more than what the class representatives will get if you have a successful objection?
- A. You know, I will cross that bridge when we get there. I'm not sure what -- what anybody is going to end up getting.
- Q. It says, "you understand that it cannot be determined with certainty in advance whether you will qualify for an incentive payment or award at all." Do

Page 75 1 you see that? 2 Α. I see that sentence. 3 Do you know why that is? Well, you know, it's the nature of litigation 4 5 that it's uncertain. 6 If you go to the next section, Section 3.3, 7 attorneys' fees, do you see that? 8 Α. I see that paragraph. 9 If you sort of go to the middle it says, "The 10 attorneys' fees will be paid by the defendants and/or as part of the attorneys' fees awarded to class counsel 11 12 and/or awarded by the court and never from your portion 13 of the recovery or settlement under paragraphs 3.1 or 14 3.2." Do you see that? 15 Α. I see that sentence. So you understand that if your counsel -- if 16 17 your objection is successful, your counsel will be 18 seeking fees from the settlement in the same way that we 19 have sought fees from the settlement, the class counsel 20 have sought fees, right? 21 I understand that they will be seeking, you 22 know, compensation for their time and efforts. 23 And you have no problem with your counsel 24 getting money from the same pot or fund for fees that 25 you're criticizing class counsel for taking in this

	Page 76
1	case?
2	A. I think they're entitled to a reasonable fee.
3	I think class counsel is entitled to a reasonable fee.
4	Q. If you turn to Section 5.4 of this retainer
5	agreement, deposition, do you see that?
6	A. I see that paragraph.
7	Q. So you knew before you even signed this
8	retainer that you could be deposed in this litigation,
9	correct?
10	A. I was aware that I may be deposed.
11	Q. And you had no concerns with signing the
12	retainer and being deposed at that time, right?
13	A. I knew it was a requirement from the class
14	notice.
15	Q. And you signed it anyway, right?
16	A. I did sign it.
17	Q. And it says in the third sentence, "The
18	attorneys taking your deposition may inquire about
19	personal matters and criticize your objection."
20	I haven't inquired about any personal
21	matters for you, have I?
22	A. It depends on personal. Not deeply personal,
23	no. I mean, my employment, which isn't relevant to the
24	case, but nothing personal personal.
25	Q. It says, "They may also have criticisms of the

Page 77 1 Bandas Law Firm for its prior representation of other 2 objecting class members." Do you see that? I do see that. 3 Α. And it was similar to the language that we just 4 5 went through from Mr. Bandas about courts have 6 criticized him, right? 7 Well, they both reference criticism. Right. And you didn't ask for details when you 8 Q. 9 saw this in the retainer agreement either, correct? 10 I didn't ask for any particular details about 11 any particular case. 12 And have you ever Googled Mr. Bandas and 13 objections or looked for information about his prior 14 objections on the Internet? 15 Α. I have not. 16 And you want to hire the most ethical law firm 17 that you can to represent you in handling an objection 18 like this, right? 19 I want to hire the most competent and 20 professional and ethical attorneys that I know. 21 And do you know if Mr. -- if the court has ever 22 sanctioned the Bandas Law Firm for filing frivolous 23 objections in other cases? 24 I couldn't answer that one way or the other. Α. 25 Q. Do you know if Mr. Bandas has ever admitted to

Page 78 unauthorized practice of law without a license related 1 2 to objections in class actions? I've not seen anything that documents that. 3 Would that concern you if that were the case? 5 Α. Well, out of context. I'd have to know the 6 context. 7 MR. PIZZIRUSSO: And let's mark this as Exhibit 8. 8 9 (Exhibit No. 8 was marked.) 10 (By Mr. Pizzirusso) This is also an attachment 11 to your objection, cases in which Mr. Clore, Mr. Bandas, 12 and/or the Bandas Law Firm have represented class 13 members in filing an objection to a class-action 14 settlement in the preceding five years. Do you see that? 15 16 I see that title, yes. 17 And I think you said you haven't looked at any of their objections or rulings in any of these cases 18 19 listed here; is that right? 20 I have not researched any of these cases. 21 But you know they objected in at least 44 other 22 cases that they listed right here, correct, in the last 23 five years? 24 That's the number listed here, yes. Α. 25 (Exhibit No. 9 was marked.)

- Q. (By Mr. Pizzirusso) Okay. Let's mark this as
 Exhibit 9. I'm handing you an article from Class Action
 News titled Notorious Serial Objector May Have Filed His
 Last Objection. Do you see that?
 - A. I see the title, yes.
 - Q. And have you ever seen this article before?
 - A. I have not seen this article before.
- Q. And Mr. Bandas didn't provide this to you, I assume, then?
 - A. I have not seen it before.
- Q. So the first paragraph says, "Texas attorney, Christopher Bandas, has made a name for himself in the legal community and not in a good way. Regarded as the most prolific serial objector in the country, Bandas routinely objects to class-action settlements hoping to leverage a payment from the settling attorney to simply go away." Do you see that?
 - A. I see the first paragraph.
- Q. It says, "The business model seen as a form of legal extortion among critics has paid Banda handsomely over the years, but two recent court rulings and revisions to the Rules of Civil Procedure may signal an end to this much maligned practice. The first whiff of trouble for Bandas came on November 20th last year" -- this was written in 2019, so that would be November

20th, 2018 -- "when an Illinois appellate court found Bandas had engaged in an unethical pattern of rent seeking behavior. The appeals court judges also found Bandas had engaged in a fraud on the court, worthy of discipline by the state." Do you see that?

- A. I see that paragraph.
- Q. And this is the first time you've ever heard about that?
 - A. This is the first time I've seen this article.
- Q. All right. Well, let's look at that decision that is being referenced here.

(Exhibit No. 10 was marked.)

- Q. (By Mr. Pizzirusso) And I've handed you a copy of the decision in Clark v. Gannett, 2018 IL App (1st), 172041. And I think you said you've never seen this decision, right?
 - A. That's correct.
- Q. All right. If you turn to paragraph 11 of this, paragraphs 70 and 71, and it's talking about the objection brought in this case. But if you scroll down in the middle of this paragraph or actually the third sentence, it says, "As noted in Judge Pallmeyer's ruling in Edelson PC, courts nationwide have denounced defendant's behavior, specifically Bandas, Thut, T-h-u-t, and Stewart. The Gannett case was cited as one

Page 81 of 15 lawsuits since 2009 in which Bandas, Thut and 1 2 Stewart have repeated the same basic pattern, frivolously object, appeal its denial, settle out of 3 court and withdraw." Do you see that? 4 5 Α. I see that sentence. It says, "One federal judge found that Bandas 6 7 routinely represents objectors purporting to challenge class-action settlements and does not do so to 8 9 effectuate changes to settlements, but does so for his 10 own personal financial gain and has been excoriated by courts for this conduct," cites a case. 11 12 Another federal judge described Mr. Bandas 13 as "a known vexatious appellant who has been repeatedly 14 admonished for pursuing frivolous appeals of objections 15 to class-action settlements." Cites some cases. Then in paragraph 71, "the same pattern of 16 17 rent seeking behavior expressed in Edelson PC exists 18 here." Do you see that? 19 I see that sentence. 20 Q. And that was the quote from the article we just 21 read. Does that concern you at all? 22 Well, I've read everything out of context.

Q. Okay. And if you go to the bottom of paragraph 71, it says, "Therefore, we vacate the order denying the

can't tell you one way or the other.

23

24

Page 82 motion for Rule 137 sanctions, remand the matter to 1 2 trial court. We direct the Court to conduct a new hearing with admission of evidence of similar conduct in 3 other cases to determine whether the objection was 4 5 indeed filed for improper purpose." Do you see that? 6 I see that sentence. 7 If you turn back to -- I don't know what exhibit it was, but the exhibit with the list of cases 8 Mr. Bandas and Mr. Clore have been involved in. 9 10 Α. (Witness complies.) Do you have that in front of you? Turn to No. 11 12 That's the Clark v. Gannett case that we just read 13 about, right? 14 It's the same name, yes. 15 Q. Yeah. And under the description of that case, 16 it says, "Objections struck as contempt for objector 17 failing to appear for hearing. Appeal dismissed for 18 lack of jurisdiction." Do you see that? 19 I see that. Α. 20 In reading what I just read to you, how they're 21 vacating the order denying sanctions, remanding for a 22 new hearing to allow evidence of other similar conduct 23 in other cases, does this appear to you to be an appeal 24 dismissed for lack of jurisdiction?

Well, it's remanded, so I don't know what --

Α.

what was the ultimate conclusion of this case. I've just been read a couple of sentences out of two paragraphs.

- Q. Well, if you want to read the whole case, we can go off the record and do that. That would be fine with me. I'm just trying to understand if you think that remanding for an additional Rule 137 sanctions hearing to allow more evidence means an appeal was dismissed for lack of jurisdiction in your knowledge as a lawyer?
 - A. I'm sorry?

- Q. As an attorney, do you think that it is an accurate description to say an appeal was dismissed for lack of jurisdiction when in realty it says that they're vacating the order, denying sanctions, remanding to the trial court to allow new hearing with admission of evidence of similar conduct in other cases to determine whether the objection was filed for an improper purpose. Do you think that's an accurate description?
- A. Well, it sounds like the Court hasn't ruled on the merits of the objection in this -- in this order.
- Q. Let's refer you to number -- paragraph 85 in the same decision. It says, "Bandas and Thut and Stewart, by extension, have taken advantage of a situation described as mirky and with unpredictable or

Page 84 1 sporadic enforcement with a vastly uncertain scope of 2 jurisdictional restrictions in various states." There's a cite. 3 Paragraph 86: "We reverse the judgment of 4 5 the circuit court of Cook County, remand for further 6 proceedings consistent with this opinion. The clerk of 7 our court is directed to forward a copy of this order to the ARDC to determine whether disciplinary action should 8 9 be taken against Bandas and Thut." Do you see that? 10 Α. I see that paragraph. Again, does that sound like a dismissal of an 11 12 appeal for lack of jurisdiction? 13 Again, I haven't read this opinion. I don't 14 know if it addresses the merits of the objection. 15 But it didn't say appeal is dismissed for lack 16 of jurisdiction, correct? 17 Well, it doesn't address the merits of the 18 objection at all. 19 But it doesn't -- it doesn't dismiss the appeal 20 for lack of jurisdiction? Do you see that anywhere? 21 A. Well, again, I don't know what -- is it an 22 appeal of the objection or -- or this is an appeal of 23 a -- of a denial of a sanctions award? I don't know if

Okay. And then the one sentence I missed

Q.

those are the same thing.

24

Page 85 1 unfortunately in paragraph 85: "Both attorneys have engaged in a fraud on the court." Do you see that? 2 I see that sentence. 3 Α. Does it concern you that your counsel has been 4 5 found by an appellate court in Illinois to engage in a fraud on the court? 6 7 Again, you know, this is out of context, and Rob is an attorney that I know and trust. 8 But Rob didn't sign your retainer agreement; 9 10 Mr. Bandas did, correct? A. My understanding is that Chris is a principal 11 12 of the firm. 13 And you didn't know that Mr. Bandas had been described as having been engaged in a fraud on the court 14 15 before you retained him, correct? 16 I have not seen this order before. 17 As an attorney, do you think it's acceptable to retain counsel that has been engaged in fraud for filing 18 frivolous objections? 19 20 I think that attorneys are routinely -- you 21 know, lose cases, and that can happen in a various 22 number of ways. 23 Has any court ever said that you've engaged in 24 a fraud on the court? 25 I have not had that order, no.

- Q. And back to the article that we were referring to earlier, it says -- if you go down to the second paragraph from the bottom, do you see it?
 - A. What page?

- Q. I'm sorry, page 1.
- A. Which paragraph?
- Q. The second paragraph from the bottom. "And on January 17th" -- do you see that?
 - A. I see that.
- Q. It says, "On January 17th, District Court Judge Rebecca Pallmeyer" -- P-a-1-1-m-e-y-e-r -- "issued an attention getting order finding that Bandas had engaged in the unauthorized practice of law. The order responded to Bandas' own admission of responsibility in a lawsuit in federal court in Chicago that alleged professional misconduct. The lawsuit followed the fact pattern in the Gannett case but portrayed it as a single chapter in an illegal racketeering scheme being replicated in jurisdictions across the country.

Pallmeyer also issued a permanent injunction that placed new limits on Bandas' ability to object in any state or federal jurisdiction in the country." Were you aware of that ruling?

- A. I have not seen this order.
- Q. And does the fact that a federal judge in

Page 87 1 Chicago issued an injunction on the Bandas Law Firm's 2 ability to file objections in any other court in the country concern you at all? Don't you think as an 3 objector your counsel should have let you know that 4 5 there's an order, an injunction about how they can file 6 objections in cases in this country? 7 I think that I don't have any context for this. 8 Q. Okay. Well, let's give you some. 9 (Exhibit No. 11 was marked.) 10 (By Mr. Pizzirusso) I'm handing you what's Q. been marked as Exhibit 11. This is the final judgment 11 12 and order in Edelson PC versus the Bandas Law Firm. 13 it's -- if you turn to page 4, you can see it's signed 14 by Judge Pallmeyer on January 17, 2019, the order we 15 were just referring to in that article. Do you see 16 that? 17 I see signed by the same judge. 18 And the same date as that referred to in the Ο. 19 article? 20 Α. Okay. 21 Now, if you turn to page 2 of this order, Acts 22 Restrained Or Required, do you see that? 23 I see that heading. Α. 24 And it says, "Defendants, the Bandas Law Firm 25 PC and Christopher A. Bandas, are hereby restrained and

Page 88 1 permanently enjoined from engaging in the following 2 actions." Do you see that? I see that paragraph. 3 So this refers not to just Christopher Bandas; 4 it refers to his law firm, correct? 5 6 I see that both are referenced, yes. 7 And Mr. Clore works for the Bandas Law Firm, correct? 8 9 He does work for the Bandas Law Firm. Α. 10 Q. So, by extension, this would apply to him as 11 well if it applies to his firm? 12 It would apply to the Bandas Law Firm, yes. Α. 13 Q. And No. 3 in this says "paying or offering to 14 pay or to loan any client any monies in connection with 15 any class-action objection, unless such payment is 16 awarded or expressly approved by a court." Do you see 17 that? 18 I see that paragraph. Α. 19 And you agree it would be inappropriate for 20 them to offer you money or payment in connection with 21 your objection unless it's awarded or expressly approved 22 by a court? 23 And they have not paid or offered to pay 24 anything. 25 Q. But you would agree that would be improper?

- A. That would violate the order.
- Q. And it says, No. 4, "Seeking admission pro hac vice or otherwise to practice in any state or federal court without fully and truthfully responding to all questions on the application without attaching a copy of this judgment." Do you see that?
 - A. I see that paragraph.
- Q. Do you know if they attached a copy of this judgment in seeking to practice in filing your objection in the Equifax matter?
- A. I have not seen any application or anything like that.
- Q. And you, in fact, have never seen this before, correct?
 - A. I have not seen this order.
- Q. And it wasn't attached to your objection, was it?
 - A. It was not attached to my objection.
 - Q. Do you think they should have attached this to your objection if they were seeking to practice and represent you with your objection in this case?
 - A. I couldn't answer that question. I haven't seen a pro hac vice motion or anything like that.
 - Q. Well, even if they didn't file a pro hac vice, don't you think if they're seeking to practice and file

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

an objection in a court, that they should have attached this to those papers?

- A. I see where it says they should have attached it to a pro hac vice or seeking admission.
 - Q. Seeking admission pro hac vice or otherwise?
 - A. That's correct.

- Q. Right. And then it says under 5, "Defendant shall not file or cause to be filed any objection to any proposed class action in any state or federal court unless, A, such objection states whether it only applies to the objector, to a specific subset of the class, or to the entire class, and also states with specificity the grounds for the objection; and, B, any payment in connection with the objection as disclosed and approved by the Court; and unless approved by the court after a hearing, no payment or other consideration is provided in connection with foregoing or withdrawing the objection or foregoing, dismissing, or abandoning an appeal from a judgment approving the proposal." Do you see that?
 - A. I see those paragraphs.
- Q. Also, if you look at paragraph 4 -- or, I'm sorry, Roman Numeral IV, costs, do you see that?
 - A. I do see that.
 - Q. It says, "The defendant shall pay plaintiff's

Page 91 costs in the amount of \$5,447.65"? 1 2 I see that paragraph. Do you know if a similar cost order was 3 Ο. entered -- if a similar cost order were entered here 4 5 with respect to your objection that you would -- whether 6 you or the Bandas Law Firm would pay those costs? 7 Per my contract, I would not be responsible for 8 any costs. 9 (Exhibit No. 12 was marked.) 10 (By Mr. Pizzirusso) Let's go to another case. This is Exhibit 12. 11 This case is Garber v. Office of 12 the Commissioner of Baseball, 2017 Westlaw 752183. I'm 13 assuming this is another one that you've never seen; is 14 that correct? 15 I don't believe I've seen this opinion before. 16 If you turn to page 3 of the document, the 17 third page, do you see where it starts discussion? 18 I see that paragraph. 19 If you move over to the second column, the last paragraph in that, it says, "Throughout this proceeding 20 21 Bandas' behavior has been at best unprofessional and at 22 worst an unseemly effort to extract fees from class 23 counsel in exchange for the withdrawal of a meritless 24 objection to the proposed class settlement." Do you see

that?

A. I see that sentence.

- Q. Were you aware of that holding from a court before?
 - A. I have not seen this order before.
 - Q. Does it concern you?
- A. You know, it's out of context. I couldn't tell you.
- Q. If you turn to the next page, page 4, the first full paragraph it starts at star 5, "Bandas' failure to provide any legitimate support for the whole objection would be enough to cause this court concern, but Bandas' behavior throughout this proceeding has been unfitting for any member of the legal profession.

Even though Bandas was substantially involved in all stages of the Hall objection, he drafted the Hall objection, and substantial portions of Hall's opposition brief, and he assisted in the preparation of Hall's pro se letter regarding sanctions, Bandas refused to enter a notice of appearance in this case, and he refused to sign any of the filings that he himself drafted.

Instead, Bandas orchestrated other
attorneys, Stein and Turkish, to appear on the very
filings that Bandas drafted or prepared behind the
scenes. Bandas' machinations were designed to avoid his

professional responsibilities to the court and were explicit with respect to Turkish. Turkish required as a term of his engagement that Bandas would prepare the substantive filings, including motions, and required Bandas to agree to indemnify him if he were sanctioned for his role in this case.

The sanctions indemnity provision in the engagement agreement between Turkish and Bandas appears to be up to the court to be an improper attempt by Turkish to avoid any financial repercussions or sanctional behavior and a way for Bandas to avoid any collateral consequences to himself if his conduct results in sanctions being imposed." Do you see that?

- A. I see that paragraph.
- Q. Does that concern you?
- A. Again, it's out of context. I can't answer that question.
- Q. And if you scroll down to the bottom, the next paragraph, starting in the middle, "Bandas' preparation of a meritless objection to the proposed settlement, his refusal to appear in the case despite his substantial involvement in preparing the Hall objection that exposed two of his local counsels to potential sanctions and his failure to affix his name to any of the litigation papers that he himself drafted and prepared belie his

specious assertion that his conduct was entirely innocent. Numerous courts throughout the country have publicly excoriated Bandas for the frivolous objections that he has penned and injected into class-action settlements. A district court in California, for example, wrote: Bandas routinely represents objectors purporting to challenge class-action settlements and does not do so to effectuate changes to settlements, but does so for his own personal, financial gain." There's a case cited.

"Similarly, a court in Illinois found
Bandas is a professional objector who is improperly
attempting to highjack the settlement of this case from
deserving class members and dedicated hard-working
counsel solely to coerce ill-gotten, inappropriate, and
unspecified legal fees. Bandas has filed virtually
identical frivolous objections in South Carolina, Iowa,
Missouri and Florida in settlements of similar class
actions." Again, citing another case. Do you see that?

- A. I see that paragraph.
- Q. Does that concern you?
- A. Without context, I can't comment on the merits of the objection.
- Q. Do you know if he prepared the papers in your objection?

- A. If he typed it up and wrote it?
- Q. Yeah.

- A. I couldn't answer that question.
- Q. And then if you go down to the next paragraph, "This court joins other courts throughout the country in finding that Bandas has orchestrated the filing of a frivolous objection in an attempt to throw a monkey wrench into the settlement process and to extort a payoff. His plan was thwarted when the Court permitted discovery to proceed on the sanctions motion, which ultimately apparently created more risks for Bandas than he was prepared to endure.

Hall testified that in Bandas' numerous representations of him in objections to class-action settlement, Hall has never received funds from the settlement of any of his objections, whereas Bandas has." Do you see that?

- A. I see that paragraph.
- Q. Does that concern you?
- A. Again, without -- without context, I can't tell you.
 - Q. And then if you go to the next paragraph on the next page -- or, I'm sorry, it's still part of the same paragraph. But it says, "That testimony, if true, is gravely concerning. It indicates that Bandas'

Page 96 1 settlement of objections has been without any benefit to his client Hall or to the class, according the 2 3 conclusion that many, if not most, of the objections 4 being raised by Bandas are not being pursued in good faith. Ultimately, Bandas wasted a substantial amount 5 6 of judicial time and effort without any benefit to Hall 7 or to the class." Does that concern you? It doesn't provide any context. 9 MR. PIZZIRUSSO: Let's mark this as Exhibit 13. 10 11 (Exhibit 13 was marked.) 12 THE WITNESS: Can we take a break real 13 quick? 14 MR. PIZZIRUSSO: Sure. 15 (A recess was taken.) 16 (By Mr. Pizzirusso) I've handed you Exhibit 0. 17 13, another case. I think we actually cited the 18 language from this case. I just want to turn you to --19 your attention to the page where it's cited on. 20 the third page, 533, at the top. The left-hand column, 21 second full paragraph in the middle of that it says, 22 "Bandas routinely represents objectors purporting to 23 challenge class-action settlements and does not do so to 24 effectuate changes to settlements, but does so for his 25 own personal gain. He has been excoriated by courts for

Page 97 1 this conduct." 2 There's an appendix attached thereto and a footnote citing the Brown v. Walmart case, which I think 3 we talked about, too. Again, this is another one. Does 4 5 that concern you? 6 I don't have any context to consider. 7 (Exhibit No. 14 was marked.) (By Mr. Pizzirusso) Okay. Exhibit 14, the In 8 Q. re General Electric Company's Securities Litigation, 9 10 998, F.Supp. 2nd, 145 (SDNY 2014). And if you turn to page 156, second to the last page on this opinion, and 11 12 if you look at the first full paragraph, it says, 13 "Moreover, while Hampe is appearing pro se before this 14 Court, he admits he's represented in this matter by 15 Attorney Christopher A. Bandas, who has been previously 16 admonished for pursuing frivolous appeals of objections 17 to class-action settlements." 18 And then if you skip down to the last part 19 of this paragraph, same paragraph, it says, "Hampe's 20 relationship with Bandas, a known vexatious appellant, 21 further supports a finding that Hampe brings this appeal 22 in bad faith." Do you see that? 23 Α. I see that paragraph. 24 Q. Does that concern you? 25 Α. I don't have any context to evaluate that.

Q. I'll give you one more.

(Exhibit No. 15 was marked.)

Q. (By Mr. Pizzirusso) And this is Exhibit 15, In re Hydroxycut Marketing and Sales Practice Litigation, 2013 Westlaw 5275618. And if you turn to page 4 of this document, the right-hand column top of the page, it says, "In light of Mr. Bandas' scheme, the court finds that Ms. McBean's objections were filed for the improper purpose of obtaining a cash settlement in exchange for withdrawing the objections. Although the bad motive does not necessarily mean that the objections themselves are invalid, the motive does bear on the credibility of Mrs. McBean.

The bad motive provides a reason, i.e., financial gain for Ms. McBean to insert herself into this litigation and lie about her class membership and reinforces the court's belief that she was not telling the truth when testifying about her purchase and use of Hydroxycut." Do you see that?

- A. I see that paragraph.
- Q. Does that concern you?
- A. I don't have any context to evaluate it.
- Q. Let's go back to the article that we started all this with. If you'd turn to page 3 of that article, do you see that? And then if you move to the middle

Page 99 there it says "a personal epiphany, question mark." that? I see that heading. It says, "Bandas declined to be interviewed for this story, but he acknowledged unethical, improper, and misleading conduct in filing or causing to be filed objections to proposed class-action settlements in the brief triggering Judge Pallmeyer's order." That's the one we looked at before. "He further acknowledged his reputation in courts across the country has been gravely but justifiably tarnished." Do you see that? Α. I see that paragraph. Does that cause you any concern? Α. I don't have any context outside of this article. But do you need context when your attorney admits to unethical, improper, and misleading conduct in filing or causing to be filing objections to proposed class-action settlements? No, I don't have any details on those specifics and what's -- what's involved or what that -- what that means. You need specifics to know more about whether

you should be concerned about your counsel admitting to

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Page 100 1 unethical and improper and misleading conduct in a 2 federal court? Well, I'd like to -- to know what the specifics 3 are before I make a judgment. 4 5 (Exhibit No. 16 was marked.) 6 (By Mr. Pizzirusso) I'm handing you what's Ο. 7 been marked Exhibit 16. Here's the motion where that language came from. So I don't know if you want to read 8 9 the whole thing, but I would direct your attention to 10 page 2. And it comes from a case, Edelson PC versus the Bandas Law Firm. It's defendant's motion for leave to 11 12 amend answer and withdraw counterclaim and for judgment 13 on the pleading. So this is the Bandas Law Firm and 14 Christopher Bandas, the defendants, amending their 15 answer to withdraw their counterclaim and allowing for 16 judgment on the pleadings. 17 And on the second page it says -- you want to -- are you reading it? I don't want to interrupt you 18 19 if you --20 Α. I'm reading page 1. 21 Okay. Do you now have further context about 22 what we were just discussing? 23 Well, there's no -- no details. There's no 24 factual information. 25 (Exhibit No. 17 was marked.)

Q. (By Mr. Pizzirusso) Let's mark this as 17. So this is the complaint from the case in which this order came. I don't expect you to sit here and read that entire complaint, but just so you understand, Edelson PC is a class-action law firm who sued the Bandas Law Firm and Christopher Bandas for engaging in a RICO enterprise and other violations of law in objecting to settlements to extract fees and not for the purposes of bettering those settlements. So this order came as a result of the complaint that they filed.

Now, some of those claims were dismissed; some survived. I think the RICO -- it says in actually Footnote 1, "The court dismissed the following claims, RICO claims, the claim for permanent injunction or the All Writs Act and abuse of process claim, but some claims were allowed."

So eventually the Bandas Law Firm filed a counterclaim. They withdrew it and actually asked for judgment to be entered on the pleadings. The judgment entered on that complaint.

And here's what the specific portion of this document that the Bandas Law Firm admitted to or, you know, its counsel filed on its behalf: "Defendants wish to amend their pleading to admit that they have engaged in the unauthorized practice of law in Illinois

as described in the first amended complaint, that they have violated the unauthorized practice provision of the Illinois Attorney Act, 705 ILCS 205/1, and that plaintiff is entitled to a permanent injunction the defendant shall not engage in the practice of law in the State of Illinois unless and until they obtain authorization from the Supreme Court of Illinois to do so.

Additionally, informed by this Court's opinions and the opinion of Justice Hyman in Clark v.

Gannett, 2018 Illinois App 1st 172401" -- that's the decision we read earlier -- "regarding defendant's unethical, improper and misleading conduct in filing or causing to be filed objections to proposed class-action settlements, defendants also agree that plaintiff is entitled to a permanent injunction. The defendant shall not file or cause to be filed any objection to proposed class-action settlements in any state or federal court unless such objection satisfies the following criteria."

And they go through the two that we read from the order.

It says, "In sum, defendants propose to amend their answer, withdraw their counterclaim in order to agree that plaintiff is entitled to entry of the permanent injunction it has expressly sought under the Illinois Attorney Act and also granting the additional

relief relating to any future class-action objections by defendants as proposed herein. This relief is entirely justified under the circumstances."

This is the Bandas Law Firm and Christopher Bandas' own counsel saying this on his behalf and the firm's behalf. "Defendants understand and recognize the disservice to the legal profession and the reputation of attorneys generally that necessarily attends the court's finding that yet another member of the bar and law firm has placed self-interest and financial considerations above ethical obligations.

The orders of this court are a matter of public record. Defendants acknowledge that their reputations before the courts of this jurisdiction and across the country have been gravely but justifiably tarnished. Undoubtedly, should defendants continue to practice class litigation, they will carry the tattoo of these orders with them, and they greatly regret these circumstances that bring them before the court." Do you see that?

- A. I see that paragraph.
- Q. And does that cause you any concern?
- A. You know, I -- it's, again, without context of what's actually involved.
 - Q. What additional context would you need to find

Page 104 1 out? 2 A. Well, I don't know what is the allegation of unauthorized practice because it seems like everything 3 else was dismissed. 4 5 Well, do you intend on discussing these issues 6 with your counsel to get more context about all the 7 various decisions that we've gone over today? You know, I'd have to address that with him. 8 9 can't answer that question. 10 Do you know if there are disciplinary 11 proceedings pending in front of the Texas state bar with 12 respect to Mr. Bandas or his firm? 13 Α. I'm not aware of anything. 14 Q. Would it concern you if there were? 15 Α. Depending on the details and the context. Well, the details and the context of -- in 16 17 particular an order or finding that he engaged in fraud 18 on the court. I mean, that the Gannett -- Clark v. 19 Gannett was referred to the -- sorry -- the disciplinary 20 board in Illinois. We saw that in the order itself, 21 right? 22 It may be in there. I didn't read through it 23 all. 24 Well, I think we went over it, but -- we quoted 25 it and read it to you. But is your understanding that

Page 105 1 if an attorney who is pro hoc vice in another state 2 has -- is being investigated for ethical violations in that state, that would probably also go to his home 3 state where he's barred, and they would look at that as 4 well? 5 6 That's not something I'm aware of the 7 procedures. 8 Q. You never had a court accuse you of fraud on a 9 court; is that right? 10 I have not been accused of fraud. 11 Ο. Never been accused of unauthorized practice of 12 law? 13 I have not been accused of an unauthorized 14 practice of law. 15 Yet, you have no concern that counsel who you 16 have retained have been accused of those things and, in 17 fact, have admitted to at least some of them? 18 You know, again, I've known Rob for ten years 19 and I trust him as an attorney. And I know that I can 20 trust him. 21 What about Mr. Bandas? 22 Well, I -- again, my primary contact has been 23 through Rob. And I understand that both he and Chris 24 have had a mixed bag of success.

Q. Would you refer to those numerous cases that we

just went through as a mixed bag of success?

- A. Well, there were, again, 44 class actions that they've been involved in. I think we've been through just a handful. I don't know how representative these are of their history.
- Q. But as an attorney, you have no problem being associated with counsel who have been accused of those things and similar objections?
- A. Again, I can't answer that without, you know, the detailed context of what's involved.
- Q. Do you think your choice of counsel reflects on you as an attorney?
- A. I think I chose my counsel based on my history and personal knowledge of working with and being friends with Rob.
- Q. I believe you also said at one point that you understood Mr. Bandas had an excellent reputation as well; is that correct?
- A. He has a good reputation in the community as a plaintiff's attorney.
- Q. And do you think that that's reflected by those decisions that we just went through?
- A. Again, I don't know the context of what's involved.
 - Q. But you think his reputation is still excellent

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

Page 107 1 based on what you've already read in the context you do 2 know? I think that he's earned his reputation in the 3 community. And I can't speak to, you know, other cases 4 5 that I don't know anything about. 6 Q. But you don't know about his reputation in the 7 objector community; is that correct? Again, this is my first ever objection. 8 9 don't have any other information about any other cases. 10 Q. Do you think activities of your counsel in past 11 objections are something that you wish to be associated 12 with? 13 A. You know, I can't speak to what any of their activities are. 14 15 Q. Do you think your partners would want you associated with counsel who have been accused of those 16 17 activities? 18 I couldn't answer that question. 19 If your objection is overruled, do you plan to 20 appeal? 21 You know, I'll have to cross that bridge when 22 we get there. 23 MR. PIZZIRUSSO: All right. Let's take a 24 quick break. We might be done, but I just want a second

to chat with my colleague, if that's okay.

	Page 108
1	(A recess was taken.)
2	MR. PIZZIRUSSO: I have no more questions,
3	Mr. West. I would just encourage you to re-review the
4	settlement materials to look at the value you could
5	actually obtain from claiming the credit monitoring
6	itself as opposed to the alternative cash compensation.
7	You could still maintain your objection.
8	But as a class counsel in this case and as a class
9	member, I think you will retain much more value from
LO	taking the credit monitoring in this case. So I would
L1	encourage you to look at that with your counsel or
L2	without. And with that, we would pass the witness.
L3	MR. STEWART: I don't have any questions.
L 4	
L5	* * * * *
L 6	
L 7	
18	
L 9	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	

	Page 109
1	IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
	FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF GEORGIA
2	ATLANTA DIVISION
3	In re: Equifax, Inc. §
	Customer Data Security §
4	Breach Litigation § Case No.: 1:17-md-2800-TWT
	§
5	§
6	REPORTER'S CERTIFICATION
	ORAL DEPOSITION OF MIKELL WEST
7	DECEMBER 4, 2019
8	I, SYLVIA KERR, Certified Shorthand Reporter in and
9	for the State of Texas, hereby certify to the following:
10	That the witness, MIKELL WEST, was duly sworn by
11	the officer and that the transcript of the oral
12	deposition is a true record of the testimony given by
13	the witness;
14	That the original deposition was delivered to
15	MR. JAMES J. PIZZIRUSSO;
16	That a copy of this certificate was served on all
17	parties and/or the witness shown herein on
18	I further certify that pursuant to FRCP Rule
19	301(f)(i) that signature of the deponent:
20	_XXX_ was requested by the deponent or a party
21	before the completion of the deposition and that the
22	signature is to be before any notary public and returned
23	within 30 days from date of receipt of the transcript.
24	If returned, the attached Changes and Signature Page
25	contains any changes and the reasons therefore:

Page 110 1 was not requested by the deponent or a party 2 before the completion of the deposition. I further certify that I am neither counsel for, 3 related to, nor employed by any of the parties or 4 attorneys in the action in which this proceeding was 5 taken, and further that I am not financially or 6 otherwise interested in the outcome of the action. 7 8 Certified to by me this 6th day of December, 2019. yeria Kur 9 10 SYLVIA KERR, Texas CSR #4776 11 Date of Expiration: 10/31/2021 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 24 25

	Page 111
1	ROBERT W. CLORE, ESQ.
2	rclore@bandaslawfirm.com
3	December 9, 2019
4	RE: Equifax Inc. Customer Data Security Breach Litigation
5	12/4/2019, Mikell West (#3798551)
6	The above-referenced transcript is available for
7	review.
8	Within the applicable timeframe, the witness should
9	read the testimony to verify its accuracy. If there are
10	any changes, the witness should note those with the
11	reason, on the attached Errata Sheet.
12	The witness should sign the Acknowledgment of
13	Deponent and Errata and return to the deposing attorney.
14	Copies should be sent to all counsel, and to Veritext at
15	cs-ny@veritext.com.
16	
17	Return completed errata within 30 days from
18	receipt of testimony.
19	If the witness fails to do so within the time
20	allotted, the transcript may be used as if signed.
21	
22	Yours,
23	Veritext Legal Solutions
24	
25	

					Page 112
Equifax :	Inc. Custo	omer Data Se	curity	Breach	Litigatio
Mikell We	est (#3798	3551)			
	1	ERRATA	S H E	ЕТ	
PAGE	LINE	CHANGE			
REASON					
PAGE	_ LINE	CHANGE			
REASON					
		CHANGE			
REASON					
PAGE	LINE	CHANGE			
REASON					
PAGE	LINE	CHANGE			
			-		
REASON					
PAGE	LINE	CHANGE			
PFA SON					
Mikell W	est		D	ate	

	Page 113
1	Equifax Inc. Customer Data Security Breach Litigation
2	Mikell West (#3798551)
3	ACKNOWLEDGEMENT OF DEPONENT
4	I, Mikell West, do hereby declare that I
5	have read the foregoing transcript, I have made any
6	corrections, additions, or changes I deemed necessary as
7	noted above to be appended hereto, and that the same is
8	a true, correct and complete transcript of the testimony
9	given by me.
LO	
L1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
L2	Mikell West Date
L3	*If notary is required
L 4	SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN TO BEFORE ME THIS
L5	, DAY OF, 20
L 6	
L 7	
18	
L 9	NOTARY PUBLIC
20	
21	
22	
23	
2 4	
25	

[**& - 78**] Page 1

0	1500 74:8	24 44:9	46.5 59:3,12,15
&	156 97:11	25 9:4,20 10:15,16	4776 110:11
& 33:8	15th 37:16,22	12:10,24 14:11,19	4th 1:16
1	16 4:7 100:5,7	45:6 48:4 64:25	5
1 3:11 7:1,2,4	1687 110:10	67:1	
22:16 24:19 45:5	17 4:9 87:14	250 10:22 12:6,8,9	5 3:4,15 62:5,6
47:19 68:16 72:15	100:25 101:1	12:10,18,21,24	71:17 90:7 92:9
86:5 100:20	1700 2:4	2800 1:4 109:4	5,000 73:21,24
101:13	172041 80:15	2nd 97:10	74:8
1.3 71:20	172401 102:11	3	5,447.65 91:1
10 3:23 10:22,23	17th 86:8,10		5.4 76:4
47:24 48:2,15	1:17 1:4 109:4	3 3:13 30:19,20	50 60:12,14,18
61:5 80:12	1st 80:14 102:11	41:12 59:18,18,24	500 2:15 12:23,25
10/31/2021 110:11	2	62:15 88:13 91:16	5109 5:11
100 4:8 5:22 13:23		98:24	5275618 98:5
10004 2:8	2 3:3,12 22:11,12	3.1 75:13	533 96:20
101 4:9	22:14,16 72:23	3.2 73:13	54 3:14
1020 2:15	87:21 100:10	3.2. 75:14	540-7200 2:5
109 3:6	20 9:4 10:14 12:23	3.3 75:6	558-3527 2:16
10:08 1:16	12:24 14:11,18	30 3:13 10:3	6
11 3:24 80:18 87:9	41:7 64:25 67:1	109:23 111:17	6 3:16 68:5,6,8
87:11	113:15	300 65:5	600 21:6
112 3:7	20,000 8:24 9:15	301 109:19	615 1:19 2:12
12 4:2 91:9,11	200 21:5	31 59:2,10	62 3:15
12/4/2019 111:5	2000 1:20 2:12	310 45:8,20 46:2	646 2:8
1200 65:13,20	20006 2:4	48:7	650 2:4
66:12,25	2009 22:24 81:1	32 82:12	68 3:17
125 8:9,12 12:16	2013 98:5	33 2:7	6th 110:8
12:17,19,21 65:11	2014 97:10	350 21:5	7
65:14,23 66:7	2017 16:17 63:3	357-1194 2:8	7 3:11,18 62:14
13 4:3 96:10,11,17	91:12	361 2:13,16 3798551 111:5	71:12,13
137 82:1 83:7	2018 80:1,14		70 80:19
13th 37:11 54:24	102:11 2019 1:10,16 16:18	112:2 113:2	700 30.19 700 21:6
55:1	55:1 79:25 87:14	4	705 102:3
14 4:4 49:5 50:19	109:7 110:8 111:3	4 1:10 3:14 54:3,4	71 3:18 80:19
52:21 97:7,8	202 2:5	87:13 89:2 90:22	81:16,25
145 97:10	202 2:3 205/1 102:3	92:8 98:5 109:7	752183 91:12
14th 2:7	205/1 102:3 20th 79:24 80:1	4.65 61:6 66:24	77 59:1
15 4:5 10:3 55:11	20th 79.24 80.1 22 3:12	44 78:21 106:2	77.5 59:10
55:12 81:1 98:2,3	22 3.12 23 22:3,7	46 60:23 67:6	78 3:21
	43 44.3,1		.0 5.21

[**78401 - amended**] Page 2

20404 0 40 4 6	111.0		
78401 2:12,16	accuracy 111:9	actions 21:14	admonished 81:14
79 3:22	accurate 46:3	23:13,14,17 26:6	97:16
7th 63:3	83:13,19	39:23 44:4 69:22	ads 70:6,8
8	accuse 105:8	78:2 88:2 94:19	advance 74:24
8 3:19 63:12 78:8	accused 105:10,11	106:2	advantage 83:24
78:9	105:13,16 106:7	activities 107:10	advice 72:1,10
80 3:23 45:17,21	107:16	107:14,17	affix 93:24
85 83:22 85:1	achievable 12:17	activity 64:20	agency 45:14
86 84:4	achieve 18:25	acts 87:21	agent 64:19,22
87 3:25	acknowledge	actual 17:6,7,14	ago 31:3,5,23 40:8
883-3563 2:13	71:24 72:14	44:10,11 57:10	agree 14:1 42:3
9	103:13	74:4	74:17 88:19,25
-	acknowledged	add 54:2 61:2	93:5 102:15,23
9 3:22 78:25 79:2	99:5,10	added 19:22,24	agreed 44:19
111:3	acknowledgement	45:14 60:25 67:7	47:10
91 4:2	113:3	adding 66:24	agreement 3:18
96 4:3	acknowledgment	additional 14:2,4	28:24 37:3,15
97 4:4	111:12	15:12 17:5 19:22	38:5,7 51:2,12,21
98 4:6	acquaintances	45:12,16,19 46:11	71:16,25 72:5
998 97:10	26:13	46:21 47:7 48:6	73:13 76:5 77:9
a	act 101:15 102:3	51:7 58:20 59:3	85:9 93:8
a.m. 1:16	102:25	59:12,15 60:23	alan 3:11 7:5
abandoning 90:18	acting 20:5	83:7 102:25	alcohol 6:21
ability 52:17 73:10	action 3:17,18,21	103:25	alerts 13:19 55:5
86:21 87:2	4:9 15:25 16:16	additionally 102:9	64:12
able 6:22 11:25	18:25 20:17 22:4	additions 113:6	allegation 104:2
12:15 41:19 49:13	22:5,7 23:15,20	address 5:10,12	alleged 86:15
49:22 50:6,15,23	24:15,21,22 25:21	84:17 104:8	allotted 111:20
51:22	25:22 26:2,11	addressed 58:9	allow 82:22 83:8
abnormal 74:10	27:12 33:2 34:24	addresses 84:14	83:16
absolutely 6:10	35:4,5 39:13,14,19	adequacy 61:20	allowed 9:19
19:6	43:16 44:7 56:13	admission 82:3	10:16 101:16
abstract 58:24	68:13,18,23 69:6	83:16 86:14 89:2	allowing 100:15
abuse 101:15	69:23 70:10 78:13	90:4,5	alternative 7:25
acceptable 85:17	79:2,15 81:8,15	admit 101:24	8:19 12:15 60:12
access 42:17,19	84:8 88:15 90:9	admits 97:14	60:25 65:11 66:24
64:3,15,17	94:4,7 95:14	99:18	108:6
accomplish 11:6	96:23 97:17 99:7	admitted 77:25	amend 4:7 100:12
account 65:16,16	99:20 101:5	101:22 105:17	101:24 102:22
65:17,17	102:14,18 103:1	admitting 99:25	amended 102:1
	110:5,7		

[amending - aware] Page 3

100.14	1 1 110 7	4 1 50 10	71 7 70 11 16
amending 100:14	appended 113:7	asserted 59:19	71:5 79:11,16
amount 47:6 55:8	appendix 97:2	assertion 94:1	83:12 85:8,17
58:21 59:4 65:21	applicable 111:8	assisted 68:16	97:15 99:17 102:3
74:16 91:1 96:5	application 89:5	69:15 92:17	102:25 105:1,19
answer 4:7 6:8,15	89:11	assisting 69:6	106:6,12,20
6:17,22 27:8 37:4	applies 59:20	assists 69:12	111:13
37:13 50:10 59:16	88:11 90:10	associate 40:11	attorneys 11:15,17
66:21 68:24 73:12	apply 88:10,12	associated 106:7	17:7,12,13,20 18:5
77:24 89:22 93:16	applying 65:10,12	107:11,16	18:23 20:4,11,23
95:3 100:12,15	appointed 27:11	association 23:9	21:6 24:3,5 27:16
102:22 104:9	approaching	23:16,23 24:1	28:11 29:19 30:2
106:9 107:18	38:14	associations 23:1	30:15 36:10 41:22
answers 6:5	appropriate 45:4	assume 21:23 38:6	44:22,24 45:7
antitrust 4:3	approval 28:4	79:9	47:25 48:4 53:25
anybody 44:16	approved 88:16	assuming 12:17	58:22 59:5,9,10
50:5 52:20,24	88:21 90:14,15	22:6 67:6 70:18	60:24 67:6 73:14
53:12 56:24 74:21	approving 90:19	91:13	75:7,10,11 76:18
anyway 76:15	approximate	atlanta 1:2 109:2	77:20 85:1,20
anyways 59:7	32:17	attached 1:22 37:3	92:23 103:8 110:5
app 80:14 102:11	approximately	54:6 89:8,16,18,19	authorization
apparently 95:11	32:8	90:1,3 97:2	102:7
appeal 81:3 82:17	ardc 84:8	109:24 111:11	authorize 44:15
82:23 83:8,13	area 23:6 35:6	attaching 89:5	availability 52:1
84:12,15,19,22,22	36:24 43:8	attachment 29:8	available 8:5,6,9
90:19 97:21	argued 16:5	68:8 78:10	15:13 17:22 18:9
107:20	arrangement 29:3	attachments 30:11	18:12,20 19:15,18
appeals 80:3 81:14	29:13,15	30:17	25:17 27:19 32:15
97:16	article 60:19 79:2	attack 55:20	45:20 55:20 111:6
appear 28:3,6	79:6,7 80:9 81:20	attempt 93:9 95:7	average 35:21
82:17,23 92:23	86:1 87:15,19	attempting 94:13	avoid 92:25 93:10
93:21	98:23,24 99:16	attends 103:8	93:11
appearance 92:19	articles 11:22 32:7	attention 86:12	award 7:20 11:15
appearances 3:3	32:13 34:11 60:10	96:19 100:9	11:17 48:13 73:7
appearing 97:13	aside 17:7	attorney 3:18 5:18	73:8,11,19,20
appears 22:14	asked 16:22 29:21	5:19 15:17,18	74:13,25 84:23
93:8	52:3 62:8 69:19	17:23 20:5,14	awarded 75:11,12
appellant 81:13	101:18	21:3 31:11,12	88:16,21
97:20	asking 6:9 59:8	32:25 33:9 34:3	awards 74:5
appellate 80:1	aspect 15:14	42:17,19 50:21,22	aware 10:15 19:24
85:5	assert 72:25	51:22 53:9,10,11	29:7,13 33:21
		53:12,15 69:21	35:2,12,15 44:6

[aware - case] Page 4

EQ.E 7 55:00	handagla	06.1.6	hwief (1.10.00.17
52:5,7 55:23	bandaslawfirm.c	96:1,6	brief 61:19 92:17
69:10 76:10 86:23	2:17 111:2	benefited 20:10	99:8
92:2 104:13 105:6	bar 23:2,22 103:9	benefits 7:19,21	briefed 16:5
awareness 35:19	104:11	8:18 11:9,10	bring 103:19
b	barred 105:4	13:13,16 15:12	brings 97:21
b 90:13	baseball 4:2 91:12	17:9,11 18:14,20	broached 43:5
back 17:20 22:19	based 12:12 52:21	19:14,18,22,25	broadway 1:19
35:8 59:17 65:17	56:14 106:13	24:25 25:15,16	2:12
82:7 86:1 98:23	107:1	32:14 41:4,6	brother 31:2,9,15
background 3:16	basic 81:2	47:13,16,18 48:6	31:24 38:18
51:1,11,21 68:12	basing 16:12	61:12	brought 80:20
bad 69:24 97:22	basis 19:17 20:13	best 18:24 25:17	brown 97:3
98:10,14	20:14 64:16	46:19 91:21	bullet 62:25 63:4
bag 105:24 106:1	batting 35:21	bet 25:17 50:3	bureau 63:21,23
banda 79:20	bear 98:12	better 25:19 27:10	64:1,15 66:4
bandas 2:15 3:19	behalf 28:6 44:16	27:14,15,24 39:17	bureaus 63:25
	59:19 60:5 68:17	43:24 66:25	64:4
3:20,24 29:4,14	73:5 101:23 103:5	bettering 101:8	buried 67:19
33:17,20,21,22	103:6	beyond 45:20 48:6	business 52:2
34:1 35:7 36:4,7	behavior 80:3,24	big 41:20	79:19
40:7,9 70:2,3 71:7	81:17 91:21 92:12	billion 47:19	c
71:15 72:4,7,8,12	93:11	bio 3:12 22:14,16	
72:18 73:23 77:1	belie 93:25	22:20 25:23 70:21	c 2:1
77:5,12,22,25	belief 98:17	bit 37:10	calculated 47:23
78:11,12 79:8,12	believe 7:12 8:9,24	board 104:20	48:11
79:14,24 80:2,4,24	9:13 10:2 12:4	bottom 63:14	california 94:5
81:1,6,12 82:9	13:2,8,12 14:11,15	68:16 81:24 86:3	call 34:16
83:23 84:9 85:10	15:4 29:23 30:12	86:7 93:18	called 34:16
85:13 86:12,14,21	31:25 36:19 38:12	boulevard 2:15	cancelling 66:15
87:1,12,24,25 88:4	40:8,12 44:8	breach 1:4 3:15	66:20
88:7,9,12 91:6,21	45:13 46:3,6	9:2 16:17 31:1,17	carolina 94:17
92:9,11,14,18,22	57:15 71:9 91:15	31:19 43:8,15,20	carry 103:17
92:24,25 93:3,5,8	106:16	44:7 55:18 67:23	case 1:4 7:15
93:11,19 94:3,6,12			15:20 16:13 24:5
94:16 95:6,11,13	beneficial 44:3	109:4 111:4 112:1	24:9,16 25:3
95:16,25 96:4,5,22	benefit 8:5,5,7,9	113:1	26:16 29:20 30:22
97:15,20 98:7	8:13 14:2,18 15:1	breadth 70:4	39:19,25 40:3,4,8
99:4 100:11,13,14	15:3 17:5,14,20	break 6:11,12	40:10 42:1,8,13,16
101:5,6,17,22	19:1,4,8,13 25:7	52:25 53:4 96:12	43:12,20 48:23
103:4,5 104:12	45:13 46:21,24	107:24	50:24 53:9 56:19
105:21 106:17	47:3,4,21 57:18,20	bridge 74:20	57:23 58:1,2
	63:16 67:7,8,10,11	107:21	70:10 71:3 72:13
			, 0.10 , 1.0 , 2.10

[case - class] Page 5

52 10 52 25 54 5		07.17.100.14	10.05.11.00
72:19 73:25 74:5	certainty 74:24	97:15 100:14	10:25 11:8,9
76:1,24 77:11	certificate 3:6	101:6 103:4	13:25 15:2,25
78:4 80:20,25	109:16	circuit 84:5	16:16 17:3,5,14,20
81:11 82:12,15	certification 43:21	circumstances	18:5,15,21,25 19:2
83:1,4 86:17	109:6	103:3,19	19:5,9,15,18 20:10
89:21 91:10,11	certified 43:1,16	cite 84:3	20:17 21:14 22:4
92:19 93:6,21	43:20 109:8 110:8	cited 80:25 94:10	22:5,7 23:13,14,15
94:10,13,19 96:17	certify 109:9,18	96:17,19	23:17,20 24:9,12
96:18 97:3 100:10	110:3	cites 81:11,15	24:15,16,21,22
101:2 108:8,10	challenge 81:7	citing 94:19 97:3	25:7,15,17,21,22
109:4	94:7 96:23	civil 1:21 21:12,25	26:2,11,23 27:10
cases 3:19 16:19	chance 42:25	79:22	27:12,17 30:12
26:8 35:9,16,25	change 15:8 17:1,9	claim 9:13,18,23	32:15 33:2,3
43:15 69:20 70:5	17:17,18 18:2,6,17	9:23 10:6,13,18	34:24 35:4,5
77:23 78:11,18,20	112:4,7,10,13,16	12:7,10,15 24:16	36:14 38:24 39:2
78:22 81:15 82:4	112:19	25:2,8,10 36:16,20	39:13,14,19,22
82:8,23 83:17	changed 18:14	36:25 37:2,10	43:1,4,16,20,21
85:21 87:6 105:25	41:21	38:10,15,20,22	44:4,7 45:8,15
107:4,9	changes 3:7 13:19	39:3,5 44:5,6	46:2,5,10,22 47:19
cash 7:25 8:3,9,13	46:13 63:24 81:9	54:12,13,15,20,22	47:20 48:8,14,17
8:16,19 11:13,18	94:8 96:24 109:24	54:24 60:19 63:5	50:20 51:4,20
11:22 12:1 18:8	109:25 111:10	63:6,9,10,20 65:14	52:6 53:24 54:16
19:19 45:20 48:5	113:6	66:17,18,18,19	54:16 56:5,7,13
48:22 56:4 57:16	chapter 86:18	67:18,20,21,24	57:17,19 58:2,5,7
65:23 66:7 98:9	character 36:9	101:14,15	58:13,21 59:20,21
108:6	charge 20:23 21:3	claimants 60:11	60:3,11,13,17,21
casually 35:12	charging 21:6	claimed 55:23	61:2,6,12 63:19
cathode 4:3	chat 107:25	67:15	67:7 68:13,18,23
cause 1:15 71:1	check 24:18 32:3	claiming 108:5	69:6,6,12,15,22,23
90:8 92:11 99:14	checks 13:2	claims 11:23 25:25	70:10,14,19 72:1
102:17 103:22	chicago 86:15 87:1	45:21,24 60:18	72:11,25 73:6,9,15
causing 99:6,19	choice 106:11	61:5 101:11,13,14	74:3,5,13,18 75:11
102:14	choose 8:16 25:1	101:16	75:19,25 76:3,13
ceiling 74:16	chose 106:13	clarify 6:16 11:17	77:2 78:2,12,13
cent 60:19	chris 33:22 72:13	clark 3:23 80:14	79:2,15 81:8,15
cents 60:12,14	85:11 105:23	82:12 102:10	88:15 90:9,11,12
certain 13:23	chris's 72:6	104:18	91:22,24 94:4,7,14
18:15 47:5	christi 1:20 2:12	class 1:14 2:2 3:13	94:18 95:14 96:2
certainly 12:19	2:16 21:8 23:22	3:14,17,18,20,20	96:7,23 97:17
21:17 34:19 39:16	christopher 3:19	4:9 5:6 7:19,20,22	98:16 99:7,20
43:6 47:16	79:12 87:25 88:4	8:13 9:24 10:20	101:5 102:14,18

[class - correct] Page 6

103:1,17 106:2	compares 13:4	concerning 95:25	contempt 82:16
108:8,8	compensate 62:22	concerns 18:3,7	contention 59:9
clear 10:10	compensated	40:19,23 58:8,17	context 43:2,17,22
clerk 84:6	20:11,18 29:5,7,10	58:23 67:4 76:11	78:5,6 81:22 85:7
client 21:4 29:18	48:18	conclusion 83:1	87:7 92:6 93:16
36:3 39:12 88:14	compensation 8:3	96:3	94:22 95:20 96:8
96:2	10:7,11 11:14	conduct 81:11	97:6,25 98:22
clients 68:17	12:4,16 14:12	82:2,3,22 83:17	99:15,17 100:21
clore 2:14 3:19	17:8,11 18:22	93:12 94:1 97:1	103:23,25 104:6
26:21 28:22 29:4	41:1 45:19,20	99:6,18 100:1	104:15,16 106:10
34:13 35:8 36:21	56:7,8,10,18 57:2	102:13	106:23 107:1
37:23 38:9,16	60:25 65:11 66:25	conference 23:13	contingent 3:18
44:15 68:15 72:5	75:22 108:6	23:15	continue 103:16
72:18 78:11 82:9	competent 77:19	connection 3:16	contract 29:22
88:7 111:1	complain 41:19	68:12 88:14,20	30:15 91:7
clore's 69:5,5	complaining 61:1	90:14,17	conversation
close 31:15	65:23	consequences	40:22
coerce 94:15	complaint 4:9	93:12	cook 84:5
collateral 93:12	16:8,9 42:7,9	consider 25:3 34:1	copies 51:2 111:14
colleague 107:25	101:2,4,10,20	36:6 47:16 97:6	copy 51:4 62:7
column 91:19	102:1	consideration	64:15 80:13 84:7
96:20 98:6	complete 6:4	72:25 90:16	89:5,8 109:16
come 19:2,17	113:8	considerations	corpus 1:20 2:12
32:20 50:7 65:3	completed 111:17	103:10	2:16 21:7 23:22
comes 100:10	completion 109:21	considered 26:25	correct 5:13,18,24
comment 94:22	110:2	46:4	6:23 7:15 9:6
commissioner 4:2	complies 82:10	considering 47:14	10:24 14:3 15:17
91:12	compromise 55:5	consistent 84:6	16:23 22:8,15,24
committed 47:5	compromised	consists 7:18 43:4	23:3,4,10,23 24:10
commonly 20:17	55:19	constitutes 48:25	24:11 25:21 28:4
communications	concern 36:3 59:5	49:2	29:1,10,14 30:4
52:7	59:12 71:1 78:4	contact 58:2,5	33:11 34:14,15
community 34:4	81:21 85:4 87:3	71:4 72:10,12	40:13,14 41:7,13
79:13 106:19	92:5,11 93:15	105:22	41:17 42:18,20
107:4,7	94:21 95:19 96:7	contacted 58:5	43:9 44:20 47:8
companies 26:4,7	97:5,24 98:21	71:25	47:25 49:22 50:1
company 4:4	99:14 103:22	contain 61:25	53:7,9,10,12 54:10
56:22,25 57:3	104:14 105:15	contained 61:19	54:14,21,25 55:24
company's 97:9	concerned 34:11	contains 41:12,14	55:25 56:9 57:20
compare 13:13	99:25	62:3 109:25	61:23 63:7 65:8
41:4			68:13 71:8,15

[correct - dedicated] Page 7

	I	I	I
72:5,9 76:9 77:9	countless 50:3	14:6,7,13 18:10	data 1:3 3:15 9:2
78:22 80:17 84:16	country 79:14	19:10,13 41:2,5	16:17 30:25 31:17
85:10,15 88:5,8	86:19,23 87:3,6	46:4,8 48:8 55:4	43:5,8,15,20 44:7
89:14 90:6 91:14	94:2 95:5 99:11	56:1,2 59:22	55:5,18,19 56:6,9
106:18 107:7	103:15	60:25 63:2,6,16,21	56:11,14,19,22,22
113:8	county 1:20 84:5	63:23,24,25 64:1,2	57:2 64:24 67:22
corrections 113:6	couple 32:19	64:10,13,15,17	109:3 111:4 112:1
cost 63:22 65:18	38:13 41:8 83:2	65:10,12,22 66:5,6	113:1
65:20 66:10,12	court 1:1 5:8	67:16,22 108:5,10	date 9:7 32:17
67:3 91:3,4	20:18 22:13 48:12	criteria 102:19	33:14 37:14 55:16
costs 8:17 18:13	73:7,14 75:12	criticism 70:24	57:13 64:12 87:18
19:16 63:2,7 64:6	77:21 79:21 80:1	77:7	109:23 110:11
90:23 91:1,6,8	80:3,4 81:4 82:2,2	criticisms 76:25	112:24 113:12
counsel 2:2,10 7:8	83:16,20 84:5,7	criticize 76:19	dates 37:4 49:18
7:20 15:16 17:4	85:2,5,6,14,23,24	criticized 35:24	49:22 52:1,3,4,10
20:8 23:10,16,25	86:10,15 87:2	36:2,11 70:13,22	day 1:16 52:2,2
24:2 27:10,20,22	88:16,22 89:4	77:6	110:8 113:15
28:6,20,25 29:19	90:1,9,15,15 92:2	criticizing 70:23	days 37:22,24 38:2
30:23 32:10,20,21	92:11 93:1,9 94:5	75:25	109:23 111:17
32:23 36:13,18,24	94:11 95:5,9	critics 79:20	de 12:3
37:1,2 40:12 45:8	97:14 98:7 100:2	cross 74:20 107:21	deadline 38:14
45:15 46:2,5,10	101:13 102:7,18	crr 1:17	49:19
47:19,20 48:8,14	103:12,19 104:18	cs 111:15	deal 66:25
48:17 52:4,8,14,16	105:8,9 109:1	csr 1:17 110:11	dealing 9:2,12
52:18,21 53:6	court's 98:17	current 13:3,9	10:23 12:5,25
58:2,5,8,14 71:2	102:9 103:8	14:18 33:10 41:6	december 1:10,16
73:15 75:11,16,17	courts 70:13,23,25	63:25	109:7 110:8 111:3
75:19,23,25 76:3	71:2 77:5 80:23	currently 13:6,15	decided 16:5
85:4,18 87:4	81:11 94:2 95:5	14:1 64:25	57:23
91:23 94:15 99:25	96:25 99:11	customer 1:3	decision 20:19
101:23 103:5	103:14	109:3 111:4 112:1	42:11 80:10,14,16
104:6 105:15	covering 64:6	113:1	83:23 102:12
106:7,11,13	craft 45:4	cyber 55:20 64:19	decisions 104:7
107:10,16 108:8	create 65:16	64:22	106:22
108:11 110:3	created 95:11	d	declaration 3:14
111:14	credibility 98:12	d.c. 2:4	37:11 54:6,17
counsels 93:23	credit 7:24 8:20	damage 25:25	68:9
counterclaim 4:7	9:9,16,21 10:3,8	damages 43:19	declare 113:4
100:12,15 101:18	11:19 12:2,16	dark 13:18 64:19	declined 99:4
102:22	13:3,4,6,9,10,13	64:24	dedicated 94:14
	13:14,20,22,25	JT.2T	

[deemed - engaged] Page 8

deemed 113:6	describe 15:23	74:15	drugs 6:20
deeply 76:22	described 81:12	discussing 100:22	duly 1:14 5:2
defendant 25:2	83:25 85:14 102:1	104:5	109:10
90:7,25 102:5,16	description 3:10	discussion 91:17	duties 24:12
defendant's 4:7	3:16 4:1 68:11,16	dismiss 16:5,10,11	
80:24 100:11	69:5 82:15 83:13	42:10 84:19	e
102:12	83:19	dismissal 84:11	e 2:1,1 5:9 86:11
defendants 73:15	deserving 94:14	dismissed 82:17	86:11 112:3,3,3
75:10 87:24	designed 92:25	82:24 83:9,13	earlier 11:2 55:2
100:14 101:23	despite 93:21	84:15 101:11,13	68:22 86:2 102:12
102:15,21 103:2,6	detailed 106:10	104:4	early 15:11,20
103:13,16	details 15:15 16:6	dismissing 90:18	16:2,13
defended 26:7	17:21 47:9 62:2	dispute 37:12	earned 107:3
defense 21:12,20	77:8,10 99:21	disputed 43:1,17	easy 43:12
23:6,8,10,16 40:4	100:23 104:15,16	43:21	edelson 3:24 80:23
defined 68:3	deter 49:25 50:2	disputes 43:25	81:17 87:12
delivered 109:14	determine 82:4	disservice 103:7	100:10 101:4
demand 4:9 64:14	83:17 84:8	district 1:1,1	edits 40:17
denial 81:3 84:23	determined 74:24	45:10 86:10 94:5	education 23:21
denounced 80:23	deterred 50:2,5	109:1,1	effectuate 81:9
denying 81:25	different 25:16	division 1:2 109:2	94:8 96:24
82:21 83:15	62:16	docket 42:14,15	effort 49:24 91:22
depending 21:4	difficult 49:18	42:16	96:6
104:15	50:22 57:5	document 7:5	efforts 75:22
depends 21:15	difficulty 66:14	12:22 37:20 41:17	either 19:19 21:21
76:22	direct 48:8 82:2	44:19,25 45:4	54:1 77:9
deponent 109:19	100:9	62:14 91:16 98:6	electric 4:4 97:9
109:20 110:1	directed 84:7	101:22	elements 22:7
111:13 113:3	directly 25:2	documentation	elucidate 6:17
deposed 5:14,15	disable 65:16	10:17 12:11	email 64:12,17
26:15 50:9 76:8	disagree 42:3	documents 28:12	emails 64:23,23
76:10,12	disciplinary 84:8	30:5,7 55:14 78:3	employed 110:4
deposing 111:13	104:10,19	doing 9:25 14:23	employment 76:23
deposition 1:8,13	discipline 80:5	14:25 21:12 27:21	encourage 108:3
3:11 5:16,23 6:3	disclosed 90:14	46:15,15 47:1	endure 95:12
7:4,12 28:9,18,19	discovery 95:10	59:8 66:14	enforcement 84:1
30:3 52:10 76:5	discussed 23:14	dollars 59:1,2 64:6	
76:18 109:6,12,14	26:12 28:1,1 38:9	drafted 40:13	engage 32:10,20 85:5 102:5
109:21 110:2	38:17,19 39:9	41:22 92:15,21,24	engaged 36:18
depositions 5:17	40:21 41:1 52:4	93:25	80:2,4 85:2,14,18
5:20	52:22,23 57:22		85:23 86:12
			05.25 00.12

[engaged - fee] Page 9

101.05.104.15		71 11 12 72 2 2 2 7	1 00 16 21
101:25 104:17	estewart 2:13	71:11,13 78:8,9,25	expressly 88:16,21
engagement 93:3	estimate 5:20 55:7	79:2 80:12 82:8,8	102:24
93:8	55:12	87:9,11 91:9,11	extended 45:21,23
engaging 88:1	ethical 77:16,20	96:9,11,16 97:7,8	extension 83:24
101:6	103:11 105:2	98:2,3 100:5,7,25	88:10
enjoined 88:1	evaluate 15:15	exhibits 3:9 37:5	extensive 16:16
enroll 63:20	97:25 98:22	54:11,12	extent 69:14,17
enter 92:19	evaluation 12:12	existing 59:21	70:4
entered 91:4,4	eventually 38:7	exists 81:17	extort 95:8
101:19,20	101:17	expect 101:3	extortion 79:20
enterprise 101:6	everybody 11:9	expecting 10:7	extract 91:22
entire 15:4 17:12	27:14 36:10 50:8	expenditure 55:6	101:8
53:16 56:10 67:9	everybody's 44:1	expenditures 47:7	f
67:9 90:12 101:4	evidence 82:3,22	expense 9:6,8,12	f 109:19
entirely 10:10	83:8,17	48:23	f.supp. 97:10
94:1 103:2	exact 13:10 49:1	expenses 8:1,1	fact 12:22 52:4
entitled 20:6,11	exactly 56:20	55:15	57:2 69:11 86:16
56:4,6 57:1,15,17	examination 3:4	experian 10:4 13:7	86:25 89:13
76:2,3 102:4,16,23	5:3	13:9,15,17,22 14:8	105:17
entitlement 56:17	example 22:6 40:5	55:4,7 63:6,21	factors 73:17
entries 42:15	94:6	64:1,23	factual 100:24
entry 102:23	exceed 73:20	experience 3:16	failing 82:17
enumerated 49:5	excellent 106:17	17:23 20:1 21:8	fails 111:19
epiphany 99:1	106:25	25:24 52:24 68:12	failure 92:9 93:24
equally 59:20	excessive 45:9	69:6,14,18,25	fair 6:14 15:6,9
equifax 1:3 3:15	69:7	experienced 69:21	16:22 17:2
5:7 7:15 9:2 14:19	exchange 91:23	expert 39:14	
30:25 34:21 43:6	98:9	expiration 110:11	fairly 16:2 faith 96:5 97:22
46:14,22 89:10	excoriated 81:10	explain 67:2	
109:3 111:4 112:1	94:3 96:25	explanation 55:3	familiar 16:6
113:1	execution 71:25	explicit 93:2	21:14,16,23 22:3
equifax's 31:18	exemplar 10:2	explicitly 14:15	33:19 58:11
equitable 44:2	exh 3:11,12,13,14	61:19	faq 67:19
eric 2:11	3:15,16,18,19,22	explore 32:11	far 10:11
errata 111:11,13	3:23,24 4:2,3,4,5,7	exposed 93:22	features 63:23
111:17	4:9	exposure 56:6,9	federal 1:21 21:23
especially 11:14	exhibit 6:25 7:2,4	56:11,14,18	45:14 81:6,12
esq 111:1	22:11,12,14 30:19	express 40:19,23	86:15,22,25 89:3
essentially 52:1	30:20 41:12 54:3	58:8,16	90:9 100:2 102:18
establish 25:8	54:4,9,10 59:17	expressed 81:17	fee 3:18 7:20 11:17
	62:4,6 68:5,6,8	F	17:4 48:13 51:2
	,,-,-,-		51:11,21 69:8

[fee - go] Page 10

76:2,3	finding 32:15	follows 5:2	function 33:24
feelings 41:23	50:21 54:1 86:12	fool 39:12	fund 19:17 45:9
fees 11:15 17:7,12	95:6 97:21 103:9	footnote 97:3	48:24,25 49:2
17:13,20 18:4,4	104:17	101:13	75:24
20:4,7 27:16	finds 98:7	foregoing 90:17	funds 95:15
29:19,23 45:7	fine 83:5	90:18 113:5	further 6:16 72:14
47:25 48:4 53:25	firm 1:19 2:11,15	forgive 65:5	84:5 97:21 99:10
58:22,25 59:5,9	3:20,24 5:6 22:20	form 9:22,23 63:6	100:21 109:18
60:24 67:7 75:7	24:4 26:10,13,14	67:24 79:19	110:3,6
75:10,11,18,19,20	26:20 27:2,3,4,5	forward 84:7	future 46:23 63:13
75:24 91:22 94:16	29:14 33:8,10,17	found 33:3 80:1,3	103:1
101:8	33:20,21 35:7	81:6 85:5 94:11	
field 21:9	36:4 40:7,9 71:9	four 49:18 52:1	g
figure 18:6 38:8	71:15 72:12 73:23	63:20 65:8,13,16	gain 81:10 94:9
51:5	77:1,16,22 78:12	66:4	96:25 98:15
file 53:9,12 54:22	85:12 87:12,24	frame 32:16	gannett 3:23 80:14
87:2,5 89:24,25	88:5,7,9,11,12	fraud 57:4 63:13	80:25 82:12 86:17
90:8 102:17	91:6 100:11,13	64:7 80:4 85:2,6	102:11 104:18,19
filed 3:22 28:12	101:5,5,17,22	85:14,18,24	garber 4:2 91:11
30:2 37:10 38:10	103:4,9 104:12	104:17 105:8,10	gault 33:8 general 4:4 35:19
54:20,24 57:23	firm's 22:15 87:1	frcp 109:18	97:9
79:3 82:5 83:18	103:6	free 14:19 63:23	generally 43:24
90:8 94:16 98:8	first 5:2 19:17,17	64:15 65:8,10,12	70:3 103:8
99:6 101:10,17,23	25:20 27:21 30:25	65:22 66:25	georgia 1:1 109:1
102:14,17	31:4,7 32:5 34:20	frequently 34:19	getting 10:11 34:7
filing 3:20 49:25	38:8 45:6 58:8	37:25 62:8	43:1 48:15 57:20
58:1,9 77:22	71:21 79:11,18,23	friend 34:1 36:6	65:23 66:3 74:22
78:13 85:18 89:9	80:7,9 92:8 97:12	51:15,18 58:6	75:24 86:12
95:6 99:6,19,19	102:1 107:8	friends 26:13	give 6:4,15 37:4,13
102:13	five 3:21 33:13	34:19 35:12	62:2 87:8 98:1
filings 92:20,24	78:14,23	106:14	given 11:23 25:14
93:4	fix 18:2	frivolous 77:22	27:22 56:22
final 3:24 28:3	floor 2:7	81:14 85:19 94:3	109:12 113:9
87:11	florentino 31:10	94:17 95:7 97:16	giving 7:12 18:22
financial 57:6,9,10	florida 94:18	frivolously 81:3	27:16
81:10 93:10 94:9	focused 11:13	froelich 29:4,9,10	go 6:2 31:18 35:8
98:15 103:10	followed 86:16	front 82:11 104:11	36:12 62:13 63:11
financially 110:6	following 63:22	full 6:4 92:9 96:21	65:17 71:2,20
find 18:1 26:18	72:15 88:1 101:13	97:12	75:6,9 79:17
29:21 37:8 41:19	102:19 109:9	fully 89:4	81:24 83:5 86:2
74:7 103:25			91:10 95:4,22

[go - include] Page 11

00.22 102.20	1 1 f -1 106.4	1.: 77.16.10	:J4:4 12.01
98:23 102:20	handful 106:4	hire 77:16,19	identity 13:21
105:3	handing 7:3 62:7	hired 32:25 36:13	57:4 62:22 63:2
goal 25:6 60:6	79:2 87:10 100:6	history 106:5,13	63:13 64:6
73:8	handle 50:16	hits 13:19	ignore 17:16
goes 62:15	handled 25:24	hoc 105:1	il 80:14
going 6:1,2,8 39:3	39:22 69:20	holding 92:2	ilcs 102:3
39:7 47:10 48:12	handles 70:3,5	holidays 49:21	illegal 86:18
51:19 62:17 74:21	handling 77:17	home 5:12 105:3	illinois 80:1 85:5
goldeneye 5:11	handsomely 79:20	homeowners 26:3	94:11 101:25
good 34:4 36:9	handwritten	honest 14:21 70:7	102:3,6,7,11,25
38:25 53:1 69:24	71:17,19	hope 11:8	104:20
79:13 96:4 106:19	happen 85:21	hopefully 25:6	impact 59:4
googled 77:12	happened 31:5	hoping 11:6 79:15	impacted 31:19
gotten 24:18 94:15	35:8	hour 9:4,20 10:15	impediment 51:10
graduated 22:23	happening 16:17	10:17 12:7,8,10,24	52:11,17,21
granting 102:25	hard 5:22 15:14	20:24 21:3,5,7	impediments 51:7
gravely 95:25	51:13,14,17 94:14	hourly 20:12,14	52:14,15 53:5,15
99:11 103:15	harm 57:5,6,9,10	hours 9:4,19 10:16	important 49:23
great 15:3	57:11	10:23 12:5,9	imposed 93:13
greatly 103:18	harmed 55:17	28:16 41:9	improper 82:5
grossly 45:9	56:6,23 59:11	huh 40:2	83:18 88:25 93:9
ground 6:3	hassle 14:22,25	hulu 70:7	98:8 99:5,18
grounds 90:13	65:15	hurdles 58:17	100:1 102:13
guess 5:22 41:8	hausfeld 2:3,7 5:6	huseman 1:19	improperly 94:12
46:12	hausfeld.com 2:5	2:11	improve 11:8,11
h	2:9	husemanfirm.com	18:8 19:12 25:6
h 80:25 112:3	heading 87:23	2:13	25:18 28:2 46:19
hac 89:2,23,24	99:3	hydroxycut 4:5	60:6 61:12 73:8
90:4,5	hear 30:25 43:19	98:4,19	improved 19:1,4,8
hail 25:24	heard 18:3 31:4	hyman 102:10	53:17,19,20,21,21
half 43:4 59:1	32:5 39:11 45:22	hypothetical	73:7
60:23	80:7	56:21 58:24 59:16	improving 18:20
hall 92:15,16	hearing 28:4 31:7	hypothetically	46:22 53:23 61:10
93:22 95:13,15	82:3,17,22 83:8,16	47:24	70:19
96:2,6	90:16	i	inappropriate
hall's 92:16,18	help 27:20 51:16	i.e. 45:8 98:14	88:19 94:15
hampe 97:13,21	63:12,18	ideally 46:25	incentive 72:24
hampe's 97:19	helpful 69:23	identical 94:17	73:8,11,18,19,20
hand 96:20 98:6	hereto 1:22 113:7	identify 18:3	74:4,13,25
handed 68:7 80:13	highjack 94:13	28:24	include 37:5 47:12
96:16		20.2 1	63:22 67:24
70.10			

[included - know] Page 12

: al d a d 46.7	:4		10.2 15 20.22 25
included 46:7	intangible 47:4	judge 36:9 80:22	19:3,15 20:23,25
includes 64:1	intend 104:5	81:6,12 86:10,25	21:4,5,15,16 22:6
including 61:11	interest 29:17 44:1	87:14,17 99:8	23:20 24:7,12,17
93:4	57:25 73:1 103:10	judges 35:25 80:3	24:18,23 25:11,14
incorporate 61:20	interested 25:12	judgment 3:25 4:7	25:14 26:10,12,14
67:12	110:7	42:25 84:4 87:11	26:15,18,18,20,25
increase 18:11	internet 64:20	89:6,9 90:19	27:1,2,7,19,21,25
61:8,9	77:14	100:4,12,16	29:3,16,17,18,24
incurred 8:17	interrupt 100:18	101:19,19	31:6,22 33:1,5,12
18:13	interval 64:4	judicial 96:6	33:14,16,22 34:3,4
indemnify 93:5	intervene 26:23	jurisdiction 82:18	34:7,18,18 35:5,12
indemnity 93:7	interviewed 99:4	82:24 83:9,14	35:18,22,24 36:8,9
independently	intimations 74:2	84:12,16,20 86:22	36:10,15,23 37:1,2
25:8,10	introduction 45:5	103:14	37:8,21,25 38:1,23
index 3:1	49:4	jurisdictional 84:2	38:24,25 39:5,17
indicates 95:25	invalid 98:12	jurisdictions	39:18,21,22,24
indicating 48:21	investigated 105:2	86:19	40:21,25 41:2,9,18
individual 26:3,6	involved 14:22,25	jury 4:9	42:3,24 43:4,15,18
information 10:12	26:14 34:8 35:9	justice 102:10	43:22 44:4 45:4
14:16 51:2,3,11,22	44:3 66:10,21	justifiably 99:12	45:10,16,19 46:7
61:4 63:19 64:21	82:9 92:15 99:22	103:15	46:10,13,16 47:9,9
77:13 100:24	103:24 106:3,10	justified 103:3	48:11,21,22,25
107:9	106:24	k	49:12,17,20 50:4,8
informed 102:9	involvement 35:13	k 2:4 5:9	50:13,14,19,20
injected 94:4	93:22	keep 62:17	51:8,15 52:6,20,23
injunction 86:21	iowa 94:17	kerr 1:17 109:8	54:1 56:24,25
87:1,5 101:14	issue 38:5,9	110:11	58:13,16,24 60:17
102:4,16,24	issued 86:11,20	kind 57:4 67:19	60:23 61:1,25
injunctive 46:11	87:1	70:5	63:25 64:3,5,9,14
injury 68:18	issues 10:23 12:6	kinds 50:14 51:3	64:19,22 66:9,13
innocent 94:2	12:25 58:11 104:5	kitty 53:24	67:6 68:21,22,24
input 14:16	iv 90:23	knew 34:23 39:16	68:25 69:14 70:2
inquire 76:18	j	58:12 76:7,13	70:9,17,23,25 73:7
inquired 76:20	j 2:3 109:15	know 6:8,11,17	73:8 74:1,3,6,15
inquiries 64:10,13	james 2:3 5:5	7:10 8:2,7,17,22	74:20 75:3,4,22
insert 98:15	109:15	9:1,8,8,14 10:3	77:20,21,25 78:5
insignificant 67:5	january 86:8,10	11:18,19,22,24	78:21 82:7,25
instance 1:14	87:14	12:4 13:3,16,18,19	84:14,21,23 85:7,8
insurance 21:12	joins 95:5	14:5,10 15:10,13	85:13,21 87:4
23:2,6,8 26:4,7	jpizzirusso 2:5	15:25 16:1,18	89:8 91:3 92:6
40:4 64:6	JPARAIL MODO 2.3	17:23 18:11,12	94:24 99:24 100:3
		10.14	

[know - matters] Page 13

100:8 101:23	lawsuits 81:1	21:12 22:5 27:13	lower 8:11
103:23 104:2,8,10	lawyer 39:11	33:2 35:4,14	luckily 57:12
105:18,19 106:4,9	72:16 83:10	39:13,15 42:22	luxury 50:6
106:23 107:2,4,5,6	lawyer's 68:11	43:17 56:15 58:11	m
107:13,21	lawyers 3:16	68:13 69:6,15	m 5:9 86:11
knowing 58:10	layperson 15:14	74:4 75:4 76:8	machinations
61:4 69:23	leave 4:7 44:23	93:24 97:9 98:4	92:25
knowledge 20:1	100:11	98:16 103:17	machine 1:18
24:1 41:22 83:9	left 11:21 15:13	109:4 111:4 112:1	magnitude 15:3
106:14	16:21 33:12,20	113:1	mail 24:19
known 33:1 35:11	96:20	litigator 18:25	main 24.19
36:5 71:5 81:13	legal 3:16 43:25	litigators 20:17	maintain 108:7
97:20 105:18	45:4 68:12 72:1	little 37:9 60:12	
knows 55:20	72:10 79:13,20	62:18	making 10:6 24:16 maligned 79:23
l	92:13 94:16 103:7	loan 88:14	mangned 79:23 mark 6:25 22:10
	111:23	local 93:23	
1 5:9,9 86:11,11	legitimate 92:10	logistical 14:21,25	22:14 30:19 44:13
lack 35:2 82:18,24	letter 29:8,9,12	65:15 67:4	54:3 62:4,18 68:4
83:9,14 84:12,15	92:18	logistics 66:14,15	71:11 78:7 79:1
84:20	leverage 79:16	long 28:15 36:2	96:9 99:1 101:1
language 77:4	liability 43:6	look 35:8 37:4,14	marked 7:2,4
96:18 100:8	license 78:1	37:17 51:4 54:8	22:12 30:20 41:12
lapse 38:8	lie 98:16	59:14 80:10 90:22	54:4 62:6,24 63:4
large 43:3	light 98:7	97:12 105:4 108:4	68:6,8 71:13 78:9
largest 17:16	limit 9:15	108:11	78:25 80:12 87:9
law 1:19 2:11,15	limits 86:21	looked 7:9 62:11	87:11 91:9 96:11
3:20,24 21:11	line 21:7 41:6,6	77:13 78:17 99:9	97:7 98:2 100:5,7
22:24 23:2 29:14	112:4,7,10,13,16	looking 10:8 32:14	100:25
31:2,9,15,24 33:17	112:19	looks 37:10 54:23	marketing 4:5
33:20,21 35:6,7	link 31:25 32:2,3	63:8	98:4
36:1,4 38:18 40:7	list 20:25 52:12	lose 36:10 65:17	materials 23:18
40:9 43:8 70:3	82:8	65:21 85:21	36:13 108:4
71:15 72:12 73:23	listed 50:19 78:19	losses 8:23 9:5,7	math 13:2 59:3,7,8
77:1,16,22 78:1,12	78:22,24	35:6 55:22,25	61:3 65:5 66:13
86:13 87:1,12,24	lists 69:11	57:13,15 63:1	matter 5:7 20:21
88:5,7,9,12 91:6	literally 66:19	68:1,2	26:11,24 28:25
100:11,13 101:5,5	litigated 39:25	lost 49:20 55:13	29:6 34:8,21
101:7,17,22,25	43:1 70:9	lot 15:21 16:1,14	48:19 70:1 82:1
102:5 103:4,9	litigation 1:4 3:17	31:16 50:7	89:10 97:14
105:12,14	4:3,4,6 15:22,25	lots 31:16	103:12
lawsuit 56:13	16:7,8,14,16 21:9		matters 68:18
86:15,16			76:19,21

[max - never] Page 14

max 8:12	membership	mirky 83:25	months 31:3,5,23
maximum 8:5,6,9	98:16	misconduct 86:16	32:9,19 66:2
9:4	mention 34:20	misleading 99:6	motion 4:7 16:4,10
mcbean 98:13,15	61:14,16	99:18 100:1	16:11 42:10 43:21
mcbean's 98:8	mentioned 9:23	102:13	82:1 89:23 95:10
md 1:4 109:4	10:14 11:2 26:21	missed 84:25	100:7,11
mean 8:4 10:20	48:24 52:13 60:20	missouri 94:18	motions 93:4
11:16 12:18 15:20	67:10	mixed 105:24	motive 98:10,12
15:23 19:21 21:15	mere 56:8,18 57:2	106:1	98:14
21:20 31:23 35:15	meritless 91:23	model 79:19	move 91:19 98:25
35:21 38:4 42:23	93:20	moment 38:6	n
42:24 43:11 47:6	meritorious 41:14	monetary 18:22	
52:3 56:20 59:15	merits 42:22 83:21	56:18	n 1:19 2:1,12,15
66:17 70:21 74:16	84:14,17 94:22	money 19:4,9	name 5:5,8 16:25
76:23 98:11	met 5:5 28:11,20	27:16 47:6 53:24	31:10 79:12 82:14
104:18	33:24 34:6 49:13	54:1 55:13 58:20	93:24
meaning 19:4	50:15	59:11 62:23 66:6	nathan 2:6
means 24:23 64:12	middle 6:13 71:24	67:16 72:24 73:4	national 63:25
83:8 99:23	75:9 80:21 93:19	75:24 88:20	nationwide 80:23
meant 45:10	96:21 98:25	monies 88:14	nature 75:4
medication 6:20	mikell 1:9,13 3:4	monitoring 7:24	navigate 27:20
meet 28:13,17	3:11,12,13,14 5:1	8:20 9:9,16,20	51:20
32:21 50:23	5:9 7:5 109:6,10	11:19 12:1,16	nearing 9:14
meeting 30:2	111:5 112:2,24	13:4,4,6,9,10,14	necessarily 29:17 51:14 52:7 98:11
mega 45:9 48:24	113:2,4,12	13:14,17,18,22,25	103:8
48:25 49:2	million 45:8,17,20	14:6,7,14 18:10	necessary 113:6
member 3:13,14	45:21 46:2 48:7	19:10,13 41:2,5	need 6:11 11:20
8:13 23:9,22	59:1,2,3,10,12,15	46:5,8 55:4 56:1,2	53:10,11 99:17,24
24:16 32:15 33:3	60:24 61:5 64:5	59:22 61:1 63:2,7	103:25
38:24 39:2 54:16	67:6	63:16,21,23 64:1,2	needs 19:2
56:5,7 57:17,19	mind 15:8 53:23	64:20 65:11,13,22	negotiate 27:9
60:13 61:2,7 72:2	60:9	66:5,6 67:17,22	negotiated 27:11
72:11,25 92:13	mine 51:15	108:5,10	45:8,11,15 46:2,5
103:9 108:9	minimal 11:24	monitors 64:20	46:10,13 47:19
members 3:20	32:14 41:1 46:9	monkey 95:7	48:16
17:14 18:21 19:2	minimis 12:3	month 10:4 14:10	neither 72:18
23:25 53:24 59:21	minuscule 60:8,8	14:11,19 41:7	110:3
60:17,21 63:19	60:14,16	64:18 65:1 67:1	never 5:15 21:16
69:7,12,16 70:14	minute 37:7	monthly 13:18	21:19 23:15 24:9
77:2 78:13 94:14	minutes 10:3	64:16	24:22 25:22 39:2
	55:11,12		40:3 42:7,10,14
			10.5 12.7,10,11

[never - opinion] Page 15

56:23,23 57:3	number 3:10 4:1	82:4 83:18,21	occurred 31:17
73:20 75:12 80:15	11:23 21:2 37:24	84:14,18,22 88:15	32:18,24
89:13 91:13 95:15	47:22 49:12 60:11	88:21 89:9,16,18	october 55:7
		/ /	odds 38:25
105:8,11	60:21 61:2,8	89:20,21 90:1,8,10	
new 2:8 56:2	78:24 83:22 85:22	90:13,14,18 91:5	offer 40:17 88:20
65:16 66:16,19	numbered 1:15	91:24 92:10,15,16	offered 13:5,10,24
82:2,22 83:16	numeral 90:23	93:20,22 94:23,25	25:15 41:5,6
86:21	numerous 49:4,7	95:7 102:17,19	88:23
news 11:22 31:6	94:2 95:13 105:25	107:8,19 108:7	offering 88:13
32:7 60:10 79:3	nw 2:4	objections 35:3,25	office 4:2 26:19
night 30:6	ny 2:8 111:15	39:22 41:14,25	91:11
nominally 57:21	nye 33:8	42:2 61:20,22	officer 109:11
nonusefulness	0	67:12 77:13,14,23	offices 1:19
41:2	oath 5:24	78:2,18 81:14	officially 36:23
normal 74:9	object 7:16 38:14	82:16 85:19 87:2	oh 37:8 51:1 54:8
northern 1:1	39:7 49:13 51:9	87:6 94:3,17	okay 6:1,5,6,9,13
109:1	81:3 86:22	95:14,16 96:1,3	6:18 7:13 8:22
notary 109:22	objected 7:14	97:16 98:8,10,11	9:17 10:14 11:2,3
113:13,19	25:20,22 35:17	99:7,19 102:14	17:18 22:10,20
note 9:15,22 10:11	50:8 78:21	103:1 106:8	24:8 26:5,10
111:10	objecting 14:24	107:11	30:14 31:21 32:5
noted 9:13,18 10:6	17:24 26:11 28:2	objector 2:10 3:18	33:12 34:7,10
80:22 113:7	32:11 39:9 60:5	3:22 7:5 50:23	37:19 41:11 44:15
notice 3:11 7:4,11	65:14 69:7,12	53:11 72:19,22	44:18 54:20 58:25
8:8,10 9:24 10:20	70:14 74:13 77:2	73:16,18,24 79:3	60:2 62:21 71:20
10:25 30:12 36:14	101:7	79:14 82:16 87:4	72:9,23 79:1
45:24 50:20 51:4	objection 3:13,20	90:11 94:12 107:7	81:24 84:25 87:8
51:20 52:6 63:24	3:22 7:10 11:3,7	objectors 34:24	87:20 97:8 100:21
76:14 92:19	20:4,6,9 21:1	60:4 70:18 81:7	107:25
notices 10:4 13:18	26:14,22 29:9	94:6 96:22	old 65:16,17 66:20
notification 54:15	·	objects 79:15	older 16:19
64:10	30:10,17,21,23	obligations 103:11	one's 12:12
notifications 64:11	34:8,21 35:5 37:3	obtain 14:2 52:16	ones 45:3 50:17
64:18	40:13,16 41:11	52:18 102:6 108:5	online 24:18 32:7
notorious 3:22	42:13 44:9 45:1,3	obtained 45:13	34:11 37:10 44:5
79:3	48:2 49:19 50:1	65:25	54:20,22 64:14
november 37:11	52:23 53:6,9 54:7	obtaining 7:24	66:17
37:16,22 54:24	58:9,17 59:17,19	52:21 53:5,15	opine 20:2
55:1 79:24,25	61:18 67:9,10	98:9	opinion 35:18 84:6
nueces 1:20	73:5 74:19 75:17	obviously 6:4,12	84:13 91:15 97:11
	76:19 77:17 78:11		102:10
	78:13 79:4 80:20		

[opinions - phrase] Page 16

opinions 35:16	99:15	86:7 88:3,18 89:7	90:13,16
41:13 102:10	overall 47:21	90:22 91:2,18,20	payments 14:18
opportunity 25:1	overruled 107:19	92:9 93:14,19	60:8
65:18,20 66:10,12	owners 26:4	94:20 95:4,18,22	payoff 95:9
67:3		95:24 96:21 97:12	pc 3:20 80:23
oppose 41:17	p	97:19,19,23 98:20	81:17 87:12,25
opposed 108:6	p 2:1,1 86:11	99:13 103:21	100:10 101:4
opposition 92:17	p.c. 2:15	paragraphs 49:3	pending 6:13
opt 24:24	p.m. 1:17	75:13 80:19 83:3	104:11
opted 24:17,21,22	pacer 42:17,19	90:21	penned 94:4
57:23	page 3:2,10 4:1	part 8:13,24 13:22	people 18:9 19:12
opting 24:23 58:1	22:16 44:9,10	14:6 25:15 73:5	21:8 26:17 46:7
option 7:23,25	45:5 54:23 59:18	75:11 95:23 97:18	50:7 51:8,13,14,15
8:16,19 11:13,18	59:23,24 62:13,15	participate 24:25	52:15 55:21
11:22 14:16,19	62:17 63:14 68:16	participated 21:16	percent 13:23 45:6
18:8 19:3,19	69:4 71:17,21	24:15	47:24 48:2,4,15,20
60:12 61:10,13,15	86:4,5 87:13,21	participating 51:9	48:21 59:7
options 7:19,25	91:16,17 92:8,8	particular 11:11	period 45:21,24
17:22 19:21,24	95:23 96:19,20	14:6 77:10,11	49:19
27:19,23 32:11	97:11,11 98:5,6,24	104:17	permanent 86:20
61:11,16 72:1,11	100:10,17,20	particularly 59:21	101:14 102:4,16
oral 1:8,13 109:6	109:24 112:4,7,10	parties 109:17	102:24
109:11	112:13,16,19	110:4	permanently 88:1
orchestrated	pages 62:12 paid 20:4,8,12,14	partners 107:15	permit 27:2
92:22 95:6	20:15,16,20 58:22	party 109:20	permitted 95:9
order 3:25 16:10	59:4 62:23 63:3	110:1	person 33:24
16:11 59:11 60:18	65:24 72:24 75:10	pass 108:12	personal 55:19
81:25 82:21 83:15	79:20 88:23	passing 26:17,21	63:19 64:21 68:18
83:21 84:7 85:16	pallmeyer 86:11	33:24	76:19,20,22,22,24
85:25 86:12,13,24	86:20 87:14	pattern 80:2 81:2	76:24 81:10 94:9
87:5,12,14,21 89:1	pallmeyer's 80:22	81:16 86:17	96:25 99:1 106:14
89:15 91:3,4 92:4	99:8	pay 14:10 65:21	personally 16:6
99:8 101:2,9	papers 28:24 30:1	66:3,6 88:14,23	20:6 28:5 36:5
102:20,22 104:17	61:14 90:2 93:25	90:25 91:6	40:10 49:17 61:24
104:20	94:24	paying 14:7 29:23	71:6
orders 103:12,18	paragraph 49:6,8	63:6 64:25 65:2	petition 73:14
original 109:14	71:22 73:22 75:8	67:1 88:13	pfc 5:7
outcome 110:7	76:6 79:11,18	payment 56:4	phone 33:23,25
outrageous 49:5	80:6,18,21 81:16	57:16 62:25 73:14	34:18
outside 17:22	81:24 83:22 84:4	73:15,19,20 74:25	phrase 39:11
25:17 26:19 52:5	84:10 85:1 86:3,6	79:16 88:15,20	
	0.113 05.1 00.5,0		

[pie - provisions] Page 17

pie 17:15,16,17	pointed 40:18	preparing 93:22	professional 23:1
45:14	pointing 48:7	presume 6:8	77:20 86:16 93:1
pinpoint 47:7	population 43:5	prevail 43:12	94:12
pizzirusso 2:3 3:4	portion 11:20	previously 41:1	professionally
5:4,5 6:25 7:3	19:16 45:7 46:6	97:15	71:6
22:10,13 30:19,21	47:20 75:12	primarily 7:23	prolific 79:14
53:1,4 54:3,5 62:4	101:21	11:12 23:8	promised 72:24
62:7 68:4,7 71:11	portions 92:16	primary 51:25	proof 54:13
71:14 78:7,10	portrayed 86:17	61:18 71:4 105:22	property 26:4
79:1 80:13 87:10	pot 75:24	principal 71:9	proportion 11:14
91:10 96:9,14,16	potential 15:11,12	85:11	11:16 17:3 18:11
97:8 98:3 100:6	16:2 29:19 34:20	printed 22:18	proposal 90:19
101:1 107:23	57:8,10 60:11	23:13	propose 102:21
108:2 109:15	67:7 93:23	prior 3:16 34:7	proposed 11:20
placed 86:21	potentially 12:19	38:15 68:12 71:24	59:14 73:1 90:9
103:10	15:2 18:11 19:13	77:1,13	91:24 93:20 99:7
plaintiff 21:20	32:4 43:4 48:22	private 56:19	99:19 102:14,17
102:4,15,23	50:21 66:5	pro 39:10 89:2,23	103:2
plaintiff's 90:25	power 3:18	89:24 90:4,5	prosecuted 69:11
106:20	practice 21:11	92:18 97:13 105:1	prosecuting 69:22
plaintiffs 39:19	23:6 27:12 33:2	probably 22:4	protect 62:23
40:5 42:25 68:23	34:23 36:1 39:13	29:22 61:10,11	63:12,18
plan 28:3 41:7	43:9 44:24 46:13	105:3	protection 63:2
95:9 107:19	78:1 79:23 86:13	problem 11:4	provide 17:5
planning 38:15,19	89:3,9,20,25 98:4	48:14,17 75:23	49:22 51:1,3,11
pleading 62:3	101:25 102:2,5	106:6	52:1,10 79:8
100:13 101:24	103:17 104:3	problems 17:25	92:10 96:8
pleadings 4:8	105:11,14	procedure 1:21	provided 19:11
42:12 100:16	practices 4:6	21:25 79:22	58:20 63:21 65:7
101:19	46:19,23	procedures 105:7	90:16
please 6:4	preceding 3:21	proceed 95:10	provides 63:17
pllc 2:11	78:14	proceeding 91:20	64:3,5,9,14,19
plus 66:4	preparation 28:18	92:12 110:5	98:14
pocket 8:1,17,23	28:19 30:3,8	proceedings 84:6	providing 12:11
9:5,7 18:12 19:16	92:17 93:19	104:11	29:19 49:18 51:21
55:15,22,25 57:12	prepare 28:9	process 58:17 95:8	63:23
57:14 63:1 67:25	54:17 93:3	101:15	provision 93:7
68:2	prepared 30:22,24	produced 1:13	102:2
point 32:24 53:2	92:24 93:25 94:24	profession 92:13	provisions 1:22
62:25 63:4,12	95:12	103:7	17:8
106:16			

public 103:13	racked 41:8	reasonableness	referring 8:20
109:22 113:19	racketeering	61:21 67:13	28:21 49:11,15
publicly 94:3	86:18	reasons 109:25	50:11,17 60:15
pull 37:9	raised 34:21 38:4	rebecca 86:11	68:25 69:3 70:17
purchase 98:18	96:4	recall 9:3 10:19	86:1 87:15
purporting 81:7	ramirez 31:10	11:1 14:16 21:1,1	refers 88:4,5
94:7 96:22	rate 9:24	23:19 24:19 27:25	reflected 106:21
purpose 71:21	rates 21:8	29:11 31:1,2,20,25	reflects 106:11
82:5 83:18 98:9	rationally 66:23	32:5,7,17 36:22	refresh 30:8
purposes 101:8	ray 4:3	37:14 45:23,24	refusal 93:21
pursuant 1:21	rclore 2:17 111:2	52:12 60:21 68:9	refused 92:18,20
109:18	reach 50:15 58:7	receipt 109:23	regard 34:17
pursue 25:1,10	reached 15:7,11	111:18	regarded 79:13
pursued 96:4	33:3 34:13,22	receive 60:7 64:23	regarding 92:18
pursuing 81:14	58:10,13,16	received 64:23	102:12
97:16	read 16:8,9,10,11	95:15	regret 103:18
put 6:17 9:25 10:2	22:5 30:9 35:16	receiving 14:1	regular 55:6,8
14:12 33:14 35:21	35:18 42:7,9,10,12	recess 53:3 96:15	reinforces 98:17
37:24 41:17 55:12	67:8 70:24 81:21	108:1	related 10:23 12:6
putting 17:7,19	81:22 82:12,20	recognition 73:16	12:25 55:5,22
53:23	83:2,4 84:13	recognize 54:5	64:6 73:17 78:1
q	100:8 101:3	103:6	110:4
qualify 74:25	102:12,20 104:22	recollection 30:8	relating 103:1
quantify 57:5	104:25 107:1	31:7 39:4	relationship 97:20
quantity 57.3 question 6:7,13	111:9 113:5	record 6:18 35:20	relevant 76:23
73:12 89:22 93:17	reading 8:8 11:22	83:5 103:13	relief 46:11 103:1
95:3 99:1 104:9	21:1 34:12 45:23	109:12	103:2
107:18	82:20 100:18,20	recorded 6:3	remand 82:1 84:5
questions 58:3,14	real 64:9 96:12	recovery 75:13	remanded 82:25
62:8 89:5 108:2	reallocated 17:4	reduce 18:14	remanding 82:21
108:13	really 11:12,21	19:14	83:7,15
quick 52:25 96:13	15:14	reduced 59:10	remember 6:16
107:24	realty 83:14	reducing 58:21	31:13 32:8 40:10
quickly 38:14	reason 6:21 37:12	refer 49:4 83:22	60:19
quintana 33:8	98:14 111:11	105:25	rent 80:2 81:17
quote 81:20	112:6,9,12,15,18	reference 77:7	repeated 55:6 81:2
quoted 104:24	112:21	referenced 80:11	repeatedly 81:13
_	reasonable 20:15	88:6 111:6	repercussions
r	21:10 47:25 48:3	referred 73:18	93:10
r 2:1 86:11 112:3,3	48:19,22 76:2,3	87:18 104:19	replicated 86:19

report 10:4 13:20	requests 69:8	return 111:13,17	rights 72:1,11,25
63:24 64:15,17	required 11:5	returned 109:22	risks 95:11
reported 1:18	46:18 60:22 87:22	109:24	roadblock 50:11
reporter 5:8 22:14	93:2,4 113:13	reverse 84:4	51:23,24 52:9
109:8	requirement 7:13	review 36:12	roadblocks 49:7
reporter's 3:6	7:13 76:13	40:15,16 41:25	49:10,16 50:18,21
109:6	requirements 49:6	44:21 52:12 108:3	51:6
reports 9:9,16,21	49:12,15 50:14	111:7	rob 26:21 33:1,5,9
10:8 55:4,6 67:22	51:8,20 52:22	reviewed 13:16	33:20 35:11 36:5
represent 5:6 24:5	researched 78:20	28:11 30:1,5,5,12	36:8 38:12 39:17
39:10,15 50:23	respect 32:11 35:7	30:15,24 36:14	39:18,25 40:1,5
53:13 60:3 70:1	36:9 91:5 93:2	42:2,16 44:19	50:15 51:15,18
77:17 89:21	104:12	54:18 61:22,24	58:6,10,13,16
representation	responded 86:14	62:10	69:25 71:4 72:13
70:14 71:21 77:1	responding 89:4	reviewing 9:9 10:3	85:8,9 105:18,23
representations	responsibilities	32:13 34:11 48:12	106:15
95:14	93:1	55:4	robert 2:14 3:19
representative	responsibility	revisions 79:22	111:1
24:9,13 25:23	86:14	rico 101:6,12,14	role 71:10 93:6
26:23 74:13 106:4	responsible 91:7	right 11:4 12:2,7	roman 90:23
representatives	rest 17:17	12:14,16,18,20,22	ropes 39:16
74:3,5,18	restoration 13:21	13:1 14:8 17:24	routinely 55:8
represented 3:20	restrained 87:22	18:16 19:7,23	79:15 81:7 85:20
21:17,19 39:18,21	87:25	21:24 22:21 23:7	94:6 96:22
68:23 70:18 78:12	restrictions 84:2	25:25 27:6 28:7	rpr 1:17
97:14	result 48:8 101:9	31:19 37:12,16	rule 22:3,4,7 82:1
representing	results 93:13	42:8,15 45:18	83:7 109:18
26:20 34:24 40:5	resumé 69:19	46:18 48:4,20	ruled 83:20
represents 39:12	retain 85:18 108:9	51:2 52:14,18,22	rules 1:21 6:3
81:7 94:6 96:22	retained 15:16	53:6,25 54:9,17	21:24 79:22
reputable 69:25	27:20 36:24,25	55:2,13,14,17	ruling 80:22 86:23
reputation 34:4	69:18 85:15	57:14,19,24 62:1	rulings 78:18
99:10 103:7	105:16	62:10 65:1 67:10	79:21
106:17,19,25	retainer 28:24	67:18,23 69:13	run 19:17
107:3,6	37:2,15,22 38:5,7	72:2 75:20 76:12	S
reputations	38:11 71:7,14	76:15 77:6,8,18	s 2:1 112:3
103:14	76:4,8,12 77:9	78:19,22 80:10,16	safe 45:1
requested 7:19	85:9	80:18 82:13 90:7	sales 4:5 98:4
10:12 17:3 45:6	retaining 32:23	98:6 104:21 105:9	sanctional 93:11
59:1 109:20 110:1	36:4	107:23	sanctional 93.11 sanctioned 77:22
			93:5
			73.3

sanctions 82:1,21 83:7,15 84:23 92:18 93:7,13,23 95:10	second 49:3,7 59:18 60:1 62:13 62:15,17,25 86:2,7	seeking 26:23 71:25 72:10 73:4	serving 73:24 set 65:18
92:18 93:7,13,23	62:15,17,25 86:2,7	U	
' '		11.20 12.10 10.4	sets 74:16
7.7.10	91:19 96:21 97:11	74:4,6 75:18,21	settle 43:25 81:3
satisfies 102:19	100:17 107:24	80:3 81:17 89:2,9	settled 15:20
	section 23:2 75:6,6	89:20,25 90:4,5	16:13
59:5,11 61:8	76:4	seen 7:5 23:12,18	settlement 3:15,21
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	securing 68:17	31:6 42:14 60:10	7:15,17,18,22 8:3
	ecurities 4:4 97:9	68:10 70:6,8 78:3	8:14,23 9:20 10:9
0	ecurity 1:3 46:22	79:6,7,10,19 80:9	10:15,24 11:8,21
67:16 77:9 104:20	47:7 109:3 111:4	80:15 85:16 86:24	12:6,7 13:1,5,11
saying 17:16 39:5	112:1 113:1	89:11,13,15,23	13:14,25 14:3,13
	see 18:2,13 19:1	91:13,15 92:4	14:20,24 15:4,6,9
103:5	27:13 29:12,24	selected 55:14	15:11 16:2,21,22
says 10:20,21,25	31:18 49:5,6,9	self 103:10	17:1,7,8,12,19,25
23:1 25:24 45:6	55:8,10 58:8	selling 64:21	18:12,14 24:25
63:1,16,17 68:11	59:22 60:2 62:18	sent 31:25 32:2	25:9,18,19 27:10
68:14,15 69:5	63:1,4,13,15 65:25	111:14	27:13,23 28:2
70:13,21,22 71:24	68:18,20 69:8,9,15	sentence 45:6	32:2,6,12 34:12
72:14,23 73:13	70:12,15,16 71:2	59:18 60:1 69:5	36:12,13 39:8
74:23 75:9 76:17	71:21,22 72:3,16	70:12,16 72:3	40:20,22,24 41:5
76:25 79:11,19	72:17 73:2,3,21,22	75:2,15 76:17	41:13,15,16,23
80:22 81:6,25	75:1,2,7,8,14,15	80:22 81:5,19	44:2 45:7,9,13
82:16 83:14,23	76:5,6 77:2,3	82:6 84:25 85:3	46:1,6,17,18 47:14
86:2,10 87:24	78:14,16 79:4,5,17	92:1	47:18,21 48:3,5,13
88:13 89:2 90:3,7	79:18 80:5,6 81:4	sentences 83:2	48:15 49:14 53:16
90:25 91:20 95:24	81:5,18,19 82:5,6	separate 8:18	53:17 54:2 56:3,9
96:21 97:12,19	82:18,19 84:9,10	september 63:3	56:10,12,16 57:18
98:7 99:1,4	84:20 85:2,3 86:3	67:17	57:20 58:4,21
100:17 101:12	86:8,9 87:13,15,17	serial 3:22 79:3,14	59:4,13 60:6
102:21	87:22,23 88:2,3,6	serve 19:17 72:19	61:19,21 62:8,21
scenes 92:25	88:16,18 89:6,7	72:21 74:5	63:12,16,17,19
scheme 86:18 98:7	90:3,20,21,23,24	served 24:9	65:7 67:13 69:23
school 22:24	91:2,17,18,24 92:1	109:16	73:1,6,9 74:14
scope 84:1	93:13,14 94:19,20	service 9:9 19:10	75:13,18,19 78:14
scratch 65:19	95:17,18 97:22,23	65:1,2,24 66:3,8	91:24 93:20 94:13
scroll 63:11 71:23	98:19,20,25 99:1,3	66:20 73:16,17	95:8,15,16 96:1
80:20 93:18	99:12,13 103:20	services 7:24	98:9 108:4
sdny 97:10	103:21	11:19 13:21 18:10	settlements 34:25
	eeing 23:19 29:11	63:17,21,22 67:17	69:7,12 70:20
97:13	32:7 68:9		79:15 81:8,9,15

[settlements - substantial]

Page 21

94:5,7,8,18 96:23	simply 74:16	70:24 90:11	statement 16:13
96:24 97:17 99:7	79:16	101:21	60:15
			states 1:1 84:2
99:20 101:7,9	single 86:17 sir 43:10	specifically 17:1 28:21 39:4 69:2	
102:15,18			90:10,12 109:1
settling 69:22	sit 101:3	70:25 80:24	stein 92:23
79:16	sitting 11:3 18:17	specificity 90:12	step 53:22
shared 7:8	19:23 64:8	specifics 11:1 28:1	steps 32:24
sheet 111:11	situation 83:25	43:13 45:25 99:21	steven 2:6
shoreline 2:15	six 52:2 66:2,4	99:24 100:3	stewart 2:11 28:22
shorthand 1:18	skimmed 36:14	specious 94:1	28:23 29:3,14
109:8	skip 97:18	speculate 47:11	34:5,6 52:25
shown 109:17	slice 17:16	59:6	80:25 81:2 83:24
sick 6:21	snathan 2:9	spell 5:8	108:13
side 22:17 39:21	solely 94:15	spelled 5:9	stolen 56:23,25
40:9	solicited 72:15,18	spend 47:11	57:2
sign 38:5 44:16,21	72:21	spending 47:5	stop 51:8
76:16 85:9 92:20	solutions 111:23	spent 9:2,8,16,20	stopping 53:2
111:12	somebody 36:2,6	9:22,25 10:2,8,22	story 99:5
signal 79:22	51:17,19	10:23 12:1,5,9	straight 33:16
signature 3:7	soon 38:4	14:13 20:21 41:18	street 2:4,7
44:10,11 71:18,19	sorry 10:23 12:9	48:23 55:3,8,14	struck 82:16
72:6 109:19,22,24	12:24 22:19 38:10	62:24 67:16,22	study 62:12
110:10	48:1 54:7,8 59:25	spoke 36:20,22,23	stuff 30:9 46:14
signed 30:24 37:15	62:16 65:12 83:11	37:23 38:6,12,16	styled 1:15
37:21 38:7,11	86:5 90:23 95:23	spoken 33:23 50:4	submission 9:11
44:12,17 54:18	104:19	72:13	54:13
66:17 71:7,15	sort 71:23 75:9	sporadic 84:1	submit 12:2 36:25
72:4 76:7,15	sought 23:20	squiggly 44:12	38:15,19,22 39:3
87:13,17 111:20	73:20 75:19,20	stages 92:15	41:9 63:20
significant 11:14	102:24	stands 50:13	submitted 36:20
15:21,24 17:4	sound 84:11	star 92:9	44:5,6 54:6 61:6
57:8 70:19	sounds 14:21	start 8:6 65:19	66:18
significantly 8:11	45:18 83:20	started 58:12	submitting 10:17
signing 65:22	south 94:17	98:23	36:15 66:19
66:16 76:11	speak 6:4 34:17	starting 93:19	subscribed 113:14
similar 35:3 77:4	37:25 72:7,8	starts 91:17 92:9	subset 90:11
82:3,22 83:17	107:4,13	state 1:18 5:8 23:2	substantial 49:4,7
91:3,4 94:18	speaking 31:13,24	80:5 86:22 89:3	51:24 52:9,11
106:8	33:25	90:9 102:6,18	61:7 92:16 93:21
similarly 94:11	specific 8:15 9:3	104:11 105:1,3,4	96:5
	10:19 33:14 58:25	109:9	

substantially	survived 101:12	71:5 105:18	48:5,11,21 50:18
92:14	surviving 42:25	tenfold 61:9	51:22,23 52:10,11
substantive 33:25	switching 18:4	term 93:3	53:15,17,18,19,20
93:4	sworn 1:14 5:2	terms 16:21 17:6,6	55:17 56:3,5,17
success 35:22	109:10 113:14	29:4 41:23 59:14	57:1,5,6,8,17 58:7
70:19 105:24	sylvia 1:17 109:8	testified 5:2 95:13	59:1,6,17 60:16
106:1	110:11	testifying 98:18	61:7,18 62:9 65:4
successes 35:2,3,6	t	testimony 72:20	65:15 66:24 67:19
35:13,13	t 80:25,25 112:3,3	95:24 109:12	68:21 69:21,25
successful 20:3,9	table 15:13 16:21	111:9,18 113:8	74:12 76:2,3
26:22 74:19 75:17	take 6:12 14:19	texas 1:18,20 2:12	78:17 80:15 83:6
sued 101:5	48:12 50:6 52:25	2:16 23:3,9,16	83:12,19 85:17,20
suffered 62:22	56:2 96:12 107:23	79:11 104:11	87:3,7 89:19,25
sufficiency 67:13	taken 1:10,15 5:16	109:9 110:11	96:17 97:3 101:12
suggest 73:23	5:17,21 53:3	text 34:18	104:24 106:3,11
suggestions 74:1	60:24 83:24 84:9	thankfully 50:15	106:13,21,25
suit 2:4	96:15 108:1 110:6	thanksgiving	107:3,10,15 108:9
suite 1:20 2:12,15	takes 15:25	49:21	third 49:3,6 70:12
suits 26:3	talk 23:17 31:16	theft 57:4 62:22	76:17 80:21 91:17
sum 102:21	35:12 61:13	63:2,13 64:7	96:20
summary 42:25	talked 38:21 42:6	thereto 30:11 97:2	thought 51:5
54:13	44:4 68:21 97:4	thing 11:21 17:18	thoughts 42:21
support 92:10	talking 8:14 17:13	54:7,9 67:3 84:24	three 63:20,24
supports 97:21	17:14,15 31:2	100:9	64:1,3
suppose 12:13	53:5 55:2 80:19	things 29:24 31:16	threshold 49:1
supreme 102:7	tangible 46:24	40:25 41:20 46:25	throw 95:7
sure 5:9 6:1 9:17	47:2	50:19 62:24	thrown 15:5 53:16
10:5 14:22 15:12	tarnished 99:12	105:16 106:8	53:18
16:20 17:21 18:24	103:16	,	thut 80:24 81:1
19:12,21 20:17	tattoo 103:17	9:14,23,24 11:12	83:23 84:9
25:11,16 26:25	tell 23:19 37:17	14:17 15:2,6 17:3	thwarted 95:9
27:7 29:15,21	39:7,20 43:13	17:25 18:5,8,10,16	time 8:1,17 9:1,5,8
36:1 37:18 39:11	44:22,25 49:1	19:8,18 20:3,8,10	9:8,11,16,20,22,25
42:23 46:20,24	58:15,19 61:3	20:10,12,15,20,22	10:7 12:1,13,23
47:22 48:10 51:3	64:8 69:2 70:4,11	21:7,9 22:23 23:5	14:22,25 18:13
53:1,21 56:20	74:9 81:23 92:6	24:8,17 25:17	20:11,13,20 25:20
68:2 74:21 96:14	95:20	27:9,23 30:1,18	27:21 29:5 31:17
surprise 43:19	telling 98:17	32:10 33:18 34:10	31:19 32:1,16
74:7,10	ten 9:19 10:16	42:6 43:6,11,24	36:24 38:8,9,10,16
surprising 43:23	12:5,9 48:20,21	44:1,3,18 46:1,14	41:18 46:20 48:23
	59:7 65:21 66:5	46:19,21 47:12,20	50:6 55:3,6,7,8

[time - virtually] Page 23

57:25 62:24 64:9	trying 18:1,6 25:7	understand 5:23	v
66:10 67:16,21	37:7 38:7 51:5	5:25 6:2,7 7:17,18	
75:22 76:12 80:7	52:16 60:3 66:23	7:21,23 8:8 9:17	v 3:23,24 4:2
80:9 96:6 111:19	83:6	10:5 11:5,23,25	80:14 82:12 91:11
timeframe 111:8	tube 4:3	13:8 16:4 19:16	97:3 102:10
timeline 16:16	turkish 92:23 93:2	20:16,18 24:24	104:18
times 12:23,24	93:2,8,10	27:18 28:8 29:22	vacate 81:25
16:1,1 65:21	turn 68:15 69:4	35:4 38:13 43:3	vacating 82:21
title 68:14 78:16	76:4 80:18 82:7	45:12 46:12 53:8	83:15
79:5	82:11 87:13,21	56:14 66:23 73:6	valid 60:18
titled 79:3	91:16 92:8 96:18	73:19 74:23 75:16	value 14:5,13 46:1
today 6:22 11:3	97:10 98:5,24	75:21 83:6 101:4	46:4,7 47:13,13,14
18:17 19:23 26:15	turning 44:9 45:5	103:6 105:23	47:25 48:3,5,15,22
28:10,18 30:3,8	70:2	understanding	65:25 67:1 108:4
64:8 73:12 104:7	tv 70:6	8:21 15:10,19	108:9
told 26:17 39:2	two 38:1,2 41:24	16:3,15 65:9	valued 47:19
top 39:13 60:1	49:18,19 54:11,12	85:11 104:25	varies 21:4
96:20 98:6	79:21 83:2 93:23	understood 6:9	various 8:1,2 84:2
total 8:4,4,12 9:4	102:20	106:17	85:21 104:7
12:9,14 47:14	twt 1:4 109:4	undoubtedly	vastly 84:1
totals 8:2	type 12:4 21:11	103:16	verify 111:9
track 35:20	54:18 58:11 70:3	unethical 80:2	veritext 111:14,23
trading 64:21	typed 95:1	99:5,18 100:1	veritext.com.
transcript 109:11	types 35:3,25	102:13	versus 87:12
109:23 111:6,20	55:21	unfair 69:7	100:10
113:5,8	typo 40:18	unfitting 92:12	vexatious 81:13
trial 4:9 82:2	u	unfortunately	97:20
83:16		85:1	vice 89:3,23,24
triggering 99:8	u 80:25 u.s. 43:5	united 1:1 109:1	90:4,5 105:1
trouble 79:24	u.s. 43.3 uh 40:2	unpredictable	victim 57:3
true 73:5 95:24	ultimate 83:1	83:25	victories 68:17,25
109:12 113:8		unprofessional	view 56:12
trust 27:20 36:6	ultimately 95:11 96:5	91:21	viewed 56:24
85:8 105:19,20	unauthorized	unreimbursed	violate 89:1
trusted 58:12	63:18 78:1 86:13	63:1	violated 102:2
truth 98:18	101:25 102:2	unseemly 91:22	violations 101:7
truthfully 6:22	101.23 102.2	unspecified 94:16	105:2
89:4	uncertain 75:5	updated 64:16	virtually 94:16
try 11:18 25:19	84:1	upper 1:19 2:12	virtually 77.10
28:2	underlying 42:7	use 63:18 98:18	
	42:22		
	+4.44		

[w - york] Page 24

	west's 3:16 68:11	
W	westlaw 91:12	X
w 2:14 111:1	98:5	xxx 109:20
waive 73:10	whiff 79:23	y
walmart 97:3	whitehall 2:7	y 86:11
want 19:14 29:18	wintenan 2.7 win 35:23 36:10	yeah 82:15 95:2
33:13 39:14 44:25	wind 25:24	year 65:3,6 79:24
56:2 57:24 77:16	window 52:2,5	years 3:21 14:9
77:19 83:4 96:18	wish 101:24	16:1 33:1,13,15
100:8,17,18	107:11	35:11 36:5 40:8
107:15,24	withdraw 4:7 81:4	63:20 65:8,13,17
wanted 39:16	100:12,15 102:22	66:4,4,5 71:5
wanting 51:9	withdrawal 91:23	78:14,23 79:21
washington 2:4		105:18
wasted 96:5	withdrawing 90:17 98:10	yesterday 28:14
way 18:2 20:15	withdrew 101:18	28:18 30:3
27:15 43:14 50:10	witness 1:14 82:10	york 2:8
58:17 63:17 70:11		york 2.0
74:10 75:18 77:24	96:12 108:12	
79:13 81:23 93:11	109:10,13,17	
ways 20:16 85:22	111:8,10,12,19 word 5:11	
we've 16:1 28:1		
40:3 104:7 106:3	work 21:13 29:24	
web 13:18 64:19	33:6 48:18 88:9	
64:24 66:16	workday 26:19 worked 40:10	
website 3:12 22:15	.,,	
22:21 31:18 36:12	working 20:21	
36:15 62:9,9,11,12	94:14 106:14	
week 38:1 49:18	works 10:10 36:8	
49:20	88:7	
weeks 38:1,13	worst 91:22	
41:24 49:19	worth 14:22,24	
went 22:23 33:16	worthy 80:4	
33:20 58:18 59:3	wrench 95:8	
59:12 62:11 77:5	write 44:22,25	
104:24 106:1,22	writs 101:15	
west 1:9,13 3:4,11	written 29:13	
3:12,13,14 5:1,9	44:20 79:25	
5:10 7:5 59:19	wrong 8:25 45:17	
108:3 109:6,10	54:7 65:5	
111:5 112:2,24	wrote 70:22 94:6	
113:2,4,12	95:1	

Federal Rules of Civil Procedure Rule 30

- (e) Review By the Witness; Changes.
- (1) Review; Statement of Changes. On request by the deponent or a party before the deposition is completed, the deponent must be allowed 30 days after being notified by the officer that the transcript or recording is available in which:
- (A) to review the transcript or recording; and
- (B) if there are changes in form or substance, to sign a statement listing the changes and the reasons for making them.
- (2) Changes Indicated in the Officer's Certificate. The officer must note in the certificate prescribed by Rule 30(f)(1) whether a review was requested and, if so, must attach any changes the deponent makes during the 30-day period.

DISCLAIMER: THE FOREGOING FEDERAL PROCEDURE RULES

ARE PROVIDED FOR INFORMATIONAL PURPOSES ONLY.

THE ABOVE RULES ARE CURRENT AS OF APRIL 1,

2019. PLEASE REFER TO THE APPLICABLE FEDERAL RULES

OF CIVIL PROCEDURE FOR UP-TO-DATE INFORMATION.

VERITEXT LEGAL SOLUTIONS COMPANY CERTIFICATE AND DISCLOSURE STATEMENT

Veritext Legal Solutions represents that the foregoing transcript is a true, correct and complete transcript of the colloquies, questions and answers as submitted by the court reporter. Veritext Legal Solutions further represents that the attached exhibits, if any, are true, correct and complete documents as submitted by the court reporter and/or attorneys in relation to this deposition and that the documents were processed in accordance with our litigation support and production standards.

Veritext Legal Solutions is committed to maintaining the confidentiality of client and witness information, in accordance with the regulations promulgated under the Health Insurance Portability and Accountability Act (HIPAA), as amended with respect to protected health information and the Gramm-Leach-Bliley Act, as amended, with respect to Personally Identifiable Information (PII). Physical transcripts and exhibits are managed under strict facility and personnel access controls. Electronic files of documents are stored in encrypted form and are transmitted in an encrypted fashion to authenticated parties who are permitted to access the material. Our data is hosted in a Tier 4 SSAE 16 certified facility.

Veritext Legal Solutions complies with all federal and State regulations with respect to the provision of court reporting services, and maintains its neutrality and independence regardless of relationship or the financial outcome of any litigation. Veritext requires adherence to the foregoing professional and ethical standards from all of its subcontractors in their independent contractor agreements.

Inquiries about Veritext Legal Solutions' confidentiality and security policies and practices should be directed to Veritext's Client Services Associates indicated on the cover of this document or at www.veritext.com.